A DEFENCE

OF THE

RIGHT HONORABLE THE

EARL OF SHELBURNE,

FROM THE

REPROACHES OF HIS NUMEROUS ENEMIES;

IN A LETTER TO

SIR GEORGE SAVILLE, BART.

And intended for the Direction of all other Members of Parliament, whose Object is rather to restore the Glory of the British Empire, than administer to the Views of a Faction.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A POSTSCRIPT

ADDRESSED TO

THE RIGHT HONORABLE

JOHN EARL OF STAIR.

SEVENTH EDITION.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. STOCKDALE, OPPOSITE BURLINGTON HOUSE, PICCADILLY.

M DCC LXXXIII.

~~5431.7~~
Bx 2119.18.4

1841, June 1.
Bought.
1/6

TO

SIR GEORGE SAVILLE, BART.

SIR,

YOUR country eſteems your virtues highly, and ſhe has a claim upon your beſt efforts. Her condition is diſtreſsful beyond all her former calamities. The Earl of Shelburne has taken the lead in her counſels, and the object of this letter is to convince you, that this miniſter deſerves your countenance and ſupport, and the countenance and ſupport of every man like you.

Enmity has done much againſt the Earl of Shelburne. It is from an apprehenſion that malice might have ſome ill effect upon perſons even of your character, that I enter upon the taſk of the noble Lord's vindication: And I have the ſtrongeſt hopes of proving to your ſatisfaction, that at this moment of national peril, the man beſt qualified in this country to direct the cabinet of our Sovereign, is the Earl of Shelburne.

In the broad maſs of human miſtakes, not one has blinded the underſtanding and deceived the judgments of men more than the common doctrine, which neceſſarily unites the gentle virtues of private, with the bolder qualities of public ſtation. In plainer terms, that a bad man cannot be a good miniſter. The ſpecies of argument I am about to urge will not perhaps be popular. It works againſt the ſpirit of vulgar morals without doubt. But, Sir, I write to oppoſe and not to indulge the miſtaken prejudices of the world, that world which is at once the knave and coward of the creation, perpetually playing every fallacy, and blindfolding itſelf with diſguiſe and affectation, conſcious of truths, which it has not the courage to inculcate.

The virtues of little life are, without queſtion, a vere fine ſubject for declamation. It is eaſy to be eloquent upon the arts that ſoften the pains that heal up the wounds of human beings, and the deeds that exalt, ennoble, and confer a ſort of divinity upon, our mortal condition. But, I do aſſert, that the rigid honor which laughs at law, and looks with contempt upon all artificial conſtraint, the faith which binds men together by the ſacred force of truth, and the candor, which ſcorns all deception,

ception, are qualities, however admirable and excellent in the ſphere of narrow life, not only unneceſſary to a miniſter, but that theſe virtues really impede and thwart him in political purſuits. I enter a caveat againſt all haſty judgments, and deſire to be tried fairly, and patiently.

But although the *reality* of virtue is not only needleſs but abſolutely a dead weight upon a miniſter, truth muſt confeſs with Machiavel and Bolingbroke, that the *appearance* is not always injurious—it is ſometimes expedient, but never indiſpenſable—without even the appearance, I do maintain that a miniſter may acquire power, and for a long time preſerve that power.

Providence has happily deſtined men for different walks of life. It is not every man that is fitted for a court, nor have all men an equal right to great ſpheres and ſituations. *Non omnia omnibus cupiunda.* There *may* be a ſoil for inflexible honor and rectitude of mind, but a court differs from every other ſcene of life, and in no particular more than in this, that vices ſeem to loſe their own nature, aſſume the ſhape and produce the beſt fruits of abſolute virtues. The thing would puzzle us in theory, if daily

facts did not demonſtrate, that the ſame man can be at once the *King's friend*, and an enemy to all the King's earthly intereſts. How many men have acquired opulence, and maintained power in this country, upon this very principle, for the laſt twenty years!

A man that has talents, or thinks he has, ſhould ſeek a ſcene of action by any means. What are abilities without the opportunity of exertion? Power is the medium, and every method to obtain power is ſanctioned by the motive. *Neque facto ullo, neque dicto abſtinere, quod modo ambitioſum foret.* Ambition (ſays a great poet) is the glorious fault of angels and of gods. Is there a reaſonable man who can condemn Alberoni for the arts he practiſed, with a view to future greatneſs? Alberoni was even a pimp to the monſtrous pleaſures of the Duke de Vendome. Vendome placed Alberoni in that ſphere whence he grew up into a prime miniſter of Spain, and in the very *means* of his exaltation, the man gave an earneſt of the talents which in a few years afterwards blazed upon the world from the miniſter.—Inſtances of this ſort are out of number.

Since ſociety has been poliſhed into the eſtabliſhment of a court, how few have ever acquired political influence, or, acquiring, retained that in-

influence, by the auxiliary of bare virtue! The principle of my reaſoning is not weakened, becauſe two or three ſolitary caſes, like exceptions to a general rule, may be pointed out. A miniſter ſhould riſe to power by any expedient, and, riſen, he ſhould retain it at all hazards. No axiom is more ſimple or more certain.

How ſeldom have ſtates received any extraordinary benefit from the extraordinary virtue of public men; but the evils are written legibly upon the records of moſt countries. Cato's improvident honeſty burſt aſunder the only union that could have ſaved the Roman republic, if the ſalvation of the republic had really been (which I ſincerely doubt) an advantage to the Roman people. Oppoſe the conduct of Cæſar to Cato. Cato ſtigmatized the people with avarice, meanneſs, luxury, debauchery, extravagance, and injuſtice. Cæſar praiſed the people for every public and private virtue. His deportment was humble and complacent; his actions gentle and generous. Will any man ſay, that Cato was fit to lead a government? Could a great people endure to be inſulted by the very perſon who ſought their ſupport? And when I ſee Burke at Briſtol, with his bundle of virtues upon his back, daring to claim, not indemnity, but honor, for the very deeds urged

urged againſt him, as crimes, I loſe my patience until I ſee his preſumption, the folly of which is enveloped in its audacity, puniſhed as ſo groſs an outrage deſerves. The events at Briſtol and Utica ſhould be conſidered as eternal monuments of the wiſdom and ſpirit of Engliſhmen and Romans!

But, Sir, to come more directly to the ſubject in contemplation—The miniſter who hopes to proſper would adapt his mind, his habit, and his practice, to his peculiar ſituation. To poets and philoſophers he would leave the beauties of theoretic virtue. He would humble himſelf to the plain imperfect condition of mankind, and govern himſelf accordingly. He would have craft for candour, ſubtilty for ſolidity, and fluctuation for firmneſs. He would abandon integrity for expediency, and confirm that cunning was more beneficial than capacity. For open and deciſive meaſures, he would have a ſilent ſyſtem of dark and impenetrable operations; no matter how deſpicable, ſo it be obſcure. As Ægyptian prieſts concealed the frauds of their religion, ſo ſhould a miniſter hide the weakneſs of his projects, under the maſk of myſtery. He would have all the ſhow of perſonal attachment, over the moſt fixed contempt for genuine friendſhip. A miniſter would declare

clare and deny the declaration, aſſert and revoke the aſſertion. He would now ſeem completely decided upon a meaſure, which the next day he ſhould reprobate, as never entering into his head. He would have a temper to accommodate every kind of inconſiſtency. Above all other artifices, a miniſter would excel at intrigue. Intrigue is a magical veſtment, which would afford him a cloak in all his tranſitions, variations, and windings; if like a Proteus, he aſſumed all ſhapes, natural and unnatural. A miniſter would ſtop ſhort at no impediment to obtain his object, though he break through all the barriers of private friendſhip and public conſiſtency. He would ſtudy the leading weakneſs, and predominant attachments of the Sovereign, and adminiſter moſt devoutly to his wiſhes, either as the pimp of his looſe paſſions, (according to the inclination of the prince) or the pander to his political principles, however miſtaken or fatal. He would repreſent the popularity of a rival, as treaſon againſt the ſtate, and the diſſatisfaction of the people againſt himſelf, as a diſaffection to the Monarch. He would do whatever elevated and ſtrengthened his own power, and neglect *nothing* that tended to degrade or injure his enemies and opponents.

A ju-

A judicious miniſter muſt be always ſuſpicious of eminent genius, or extraordinary merit, in others. It is remarkable, that in a few months after the great Conde vanquiſhed the foes of the King of France, Mazarin (the miniſter of that King) confined Conde in the caſtle of Vincennes. Turenne conquered all before him, and Louvois (the miniſter) was conſtantly undermining Turenne in the favour of that King, whoſe glory Turenne had been increaſing by daily victories. Does any reaſonable man cenſure Mazarin or Louvois? It is the commoneſt of maxims with a miniſter, that the intereſt of the ſtate is ever to yield to his perſonal reſentments. Lewis the Fourteenth, when he invaded Holland, wiſhed to keep garriſons in all the Dutch towns. Conde and Turenne were ſtrongly againſt the meaſure; but Louvois ſeconded the King, becauſe he hated Conde and Turenne. The garriſons were continued, and this miſtake preſerved the Republic of Holland from annihilation. Mazarin and Louvois were great miniſters.

Perfection is not the gift of God to man.—And if this ſketch be not the exact reſemblance of the Earl of Shelburne, I will venture to ſay, that the noble Lord comes as nearly to the ſpirit, as human frailty will allow.

allow.—The friends of Mr. Fox, the rival of the noble Lord, imagine that *he* might be, at leaſt, as powerful a miniſter as the Earl of Shelburne, from the advantage of his ſuperior talents. But this is the dear miſtake of mankind—Superior talents are no ſecurity for ſuperior ſucceſs in courts, where trick is as beneficial as genius, and cunning is frequently more proſperous than capacity. Let us for a moment view the honorable Gentleman and the noble Lord in the leſſer relations of life, and from the contemplation of the two men, let us decide which ſeems beſt calculated to ſucceed in the cabinet of our Sovereign.

Both have been bred in all the forms of faſhionable life, but Mr. Fox appears to be ſatiated, and is grown into a contempt for all external decoration. The laborious levities of a late peer are objects only of his ridicule. Perhaps he eſteems the eaſe and politeneſs inſeparable from a man in the habits of high ſociety, as ſufficient, without reſorting to any artificial means of creating notice, or impreſſing regard. It is not unreaſonable to aſſert, that if pomp of dreſs, prettineſs of manners, or exterior neatneſs conſtituted much of a man's real dignity, a valet or hair-dreſſer would ſtand a

better chance than John de Witt, or the Earl of Chatham. This ſeems to be Mr. Fox's opinion. He puts on a fine dreſs ſometimes from duty, but never from inclination.—The Earl of Shelburne cannot deem a ſhining coat in itſelf a thing of any conſequence, but he thinks it is an inſtrument by which the multitude may pay their homage of amaze. I have heard him apologize to the Houſe of Lords for '*preſuming to come undreſſed*;' and I dare ſay without any implication of cenſure upon twenty other noble peers, who needed purification as much as himſelf, at the ſame moment. He has the ſubſtantial precepts of the Earl of Cheſterfield * for ever in his eye, and ſeldom neglects the eſſential article of a ſplendid outſide.

Mr. Fox ſeems ſo averſe to the ſubtilties of life, that he rather deters by diſtance, than ſeduces by familiarity.—Every ſyllable uttered by the Earl of Shelburne, every geſture of his body, and every motion of his face, are accompanied with a deſign either to invite the indifferent, to conciliate the hoſtile, or to flatter the friendly, by an indefatigable aſſiduity, by a politeneſs that perſeveres, and a ſmile that never ceaſes.

* Les Graces.

The

The creed of Mr. Fox is, to prefer candor to complaiſance, and rough frankneſs, to poliſhed falſhood. If he makes an engagement he thinks he ſhould not violate his faith. He imagines, that the ties which bind the private, conſtrain the public man. Under this diſadvantage he went into government, making few promiſes, and breaking none.—The Earl of Shelburne has not a heart to refuſe a requeſt, and it is difficult to impeach him with an infallible breach of promiſe, inaſmuch as no man can limit the meaſure of life. If he does not perform, who can aſſert that he *may* not. A thing is morally poſſible, where it is not phyſically impoſſible. While there is life there is hope, and to deſpair of happineſs is impiety. The noble Earl, with great management, ſeparates the private from the public man, and with a curious refinement and dextrous diſcrimination, acquits the Earl of Shelburne of any treachery or meanneſs, which may be committed by the Firſt Lord of the Treaſury.

Mr. Fox has a reſpect for the judgment of the nation, but looks to the purity of his actions for public applauſe. He never accommodates himſelf to the devices which very often influence the general voice, and indolently en-

dures a preſent evil, in confidence that his genius and integrity will rectify all in the end. —The Earl of Shelburne is convinced, that miniſters have heretofore been powerful and perpetual, in ſpite of the people's clamours, and has the moſt ſettled contempt for the world's opinion. But he knows its value, and if his ſyſtem of ſmall arts fail him, he may ſometimes relax into rectitude to acquire or preſerve it.

Mr. Fox is careleſs, where the Earl is cautious, and candid, where the Earl is cunning. His friends love him, although he is ſeldom at the pains to pleaſe by ſtudy. When he was opulent he never dreaded indigence; he is not wealthy, and yet deſpiſes riches. He will ſit with the man he values upon the ſimpleſt fare, as contented as at the feaſt of a king.—The Earl of Shelburne is the eternal ſlave of his ſociety. He courts every man. His placidneſs, his attention, his humilities are endleſs. He has the craft to appear a public enemy to luxury, and yet yields to none in the vice he cenſures. Penurious by nature, and extravagant by ſyſtem. He has the ſkill to make his ſelfiſhneſs aſſume the form of generoſity, and to make real ſordidneſs reſemble hoſpitality. He condemns

demns the ſpirit of the democratic body, but thinks the grandeur of the ariſtocracy impaired, if domeſtic pomp and outward magnificence are in the leaſt neglected.

If a man is ridiculous, Mr. Fox will laugh at him; and if he is a raſcal, he is very apt to tell him ſo.—The Earl of Shelburne never hurts a man in his preſence, but delivers himſelf with a generous indignation againſt thoſe who are abſent.

Mr. Fox thinks himſelf right, and virulently reprobates thoſe he thinks wrong. He is no apoſtate, and gives little quarter to thoſe who are. —The Earl of Shelburne never offends the ear of the greateſt knave upon earth with a harſh epithet: he knows that ſeverity of reproach may create deſperation, and therefore never irritates. —Mr. Fox has in this reſpect ſo little artifice, that he would cenſure an obnoxious meaſure, even to the Sovereign who employed him, with a harſhneſs for which the ſincerity of his counſel could hardly compenſate, and which perhaps rendered his advice ſomething more than barely unpalatable.—The Earl of Shelburne has been ſo induſtrious, even before he became a miniſter, that he never omitted to offer ſome incenſe, when-

whenever the King's name was introduced in debate. He knew the temper of his deity, and ſeldom failed to ſacrifice.

Mr. Fox is an utter ſtranger to all facility, and never ſoftens out of complaiſance into another's opinion. From the day he burſt the bandages of his political childhood to this hour, he has purſued one invariable line, without the ſmalleſt deviation. His ſyſtem is defined and deciſive.—The Earl of Shelburne is above the weakneſs of perſiſting in a principle which militates with his intereſt. He is not raſh enough to adhere to any ſeries of opinions which may impair his power, although his honor and conſiſtency were the victims of his compliance. He never entertains a peeviſh prejudice for old ſentiments when they are inconvenient, and has ſo fortunate a ductility, that he can bend to all ſides, and adapt himſelf to all ſituations. He has been twenty years an actor upon the ſtate theatre without any fixed character. His politics are ſo judiciouſly ambiguous, that no man can aſcertain their quality, from which reſults this good effect, that he is abſolutely, *nothing*, and may be occaſionally, *any thing*. He is in profeſſion a Whig, and a Tory in practice. He pretends a regard for the people's rights,

rights, and is the unqualified champion for prerogative in its moſt wide and dangerous operation.

The ſympathy which kindred qualities naturally excite, attaches Mr. Fox to men of letters, but he never ſought their flattery, and his patronage was never very beneficial. He is no ſycophant, and abhors thoſe who are. His own vanities are enveloped in his ambition, and he never adminiſters to the weakneſs of another. —The Earl of Shelburne has a vaſt diſplay of patronage, but the talents of moſt of his clients *were* of ſo abſtracted a ſort, that out of the eight millions who inhabit this iſland, not eight perſons will ever take the trouble to judge of their merit. The praiſe he applies in a higher, is acceptable to himſelf in a leſſer ſphere, and no man pays at a dearer rate for panegyric *. His aim is to be ſpoken of, and he would compound for eclat by any ſacrifice.

The noble Lord, as well as the honorable Gentleman, is ſucceſsful in diſcovering the imbecilities of the man he converſes with; but they are very different in deducing conſequences from

* The daily papers ſhew that the noble Lord's patronage is lately much extended.

the

the infirmities they detect. What Mr. Fox's pride diſdains to ſtoop to, the Earl of Shelburne's œconomy endeavours to ſhape into the poſſibility of ſome immediate or future benefit. The latter deems that valuable, which the former looks upon with contempt. The whole ſtretch of the Earl of Shelburne's abilities exceeds not the compaſs of what is termed *intrigue*. Mr. Fox deſpiſes intrigue. He conſiders it the talent of a fool and a rogue. He thinks no man but a knave would make much uſe of it, and no man but a blockhead would boaſt of it.

Such is Mr. Fox, and ſuch the Earl of Shelburne, upon the leſſer ſcale of life. To thoſe who know them beſt I appeal for the fidelity of the pictures. The abilities of the noble Earl will come under frequent diſcuſſion in the courſe of this letter; but you will obſerve, that I have excluded the talents of Mr. Fox entirely from our conſideration. To analiſe him in a view where his public enemies to a man ſhrink from beholding him, would not become me. All parties are long agreed in that point, and perhaps the thing moſt undiſputed, in this land of diſputes, is the genius of Mr. Fox. Enough however is ſeen of his principles and temper, to ſhew the deluſion of his

his friends in imagining that *he* was calculated to proſper in an equal degree with the Earl of Shelburne, in the court of George the Third.

TO SUCCEED where there is no impediment, is a puny merit. The dexterity of a ſtateſman is manifeſt in proportion to the magnitude of his difficulties. If a miniſter is ſurrounded with danger, perplexed by inconſiſtency, and involved in a labyrinth of doubt, to emancipate himſelf with *ſafety*, is a trial of his management, if not of his talents. A good deal in this ſituation ſtands the Earl of Shelburne. Parliamentary ſupport is very juſtly deemed the teſt of political truth in this country, and I hope my confidence is not too ſanguine, that the noble Earl's meaſures will be ſupported in the next ſeſſions of parliament.

In the Upper Houſe at leaſt he cannot fail, and it is a comfort to a miniſter of England, whoever he be, that if, like another Caligula, he had made war upon the moon, that illuſtrious and reverend body is ſure to give its ſanction to the planetary adventurer.

There are four or five points which are ſuppoſed particularly to affect the Earl of Shelburne, and he is ſaid to be eſpecially vulnerable as to the American queſtion.

Petitions have been preſented by ſome of the people againſt the American war, and the Parliament voted its diſcontinuance. Hence it is ſaid, the people of this country are averſe from the meaſure of its revival. Upon this occaſion (however at other times it may be expedient) I believe the noble Lord would not inſiſt upon that general maxim of all Britiſh miniſters, that the wiſdom and wiſhes of the nation reſide in the Parliament; or indeed, if he were diſpoſed to make a conceſſion in argument which operates againſt himſelf in fact, I, who write to defend him upon the principle of truth, would not therefore concur in the opinion. I deny the propoſition and the inference, and have no dread in aſſerting, that it is *not* the wiſh of the majority of the Engliſh nation to abandon the American war.

The luſt of dominion is natural in every ſoil, and the love of ſuperiority is as prevalent in this land of freedom, as in any part of the earth. The Engliſh love to be maſters, and he is at leaſt a crafty miniſter, who takes advantage of their prejudice. The people is his ſanction, and his ignorance or treachery is ſure of being ſheltered under their deluſion. The Engliſh love to hear of bloody battles, and a ſnug citizen in the corner of a coffee-houſe, who

who would ſhrink at a ſnow-ball from the hands of a boy, deems the Gazette he peruſes, a libel upon his country, if half a thouſand of his fellow-ſubjects have not periſhed in the engagement, let victory incline as it may.

The opinion of Lord North is decidedly with me upon this queſtion, and I truſt Lord North's opinion is ſtill highly valued in this country. "I have had the majority of the people with me in the American war," ſaid his Lordſhip. He ſaid the truth, and the people's voice is ſtill the voice of God. It is true, that a ſix years ineffectual ſtruggle, at a great waſte of blood, and an expence of one hundred millions, afford but an inauſpicious review upon a revival of this war; yet who is the man daring enough to ſtep into the chair of fate, and pronounce the *impoſſibility* of ſucceſs, if we make *one more* bold and brilliant effort? Such a man is not to be found; and I am well convinced, that there is not an individual in the nation with Britiſh generoſity, Britiſh courage, or Britiſh feelings, who would not contribute '*even his laſt ſhirt*' to regain thoſe colonies, of which we knew not the importance, or extent, until their intire loſs gave a mortifying evidence. Reports of a diſaffection to congreſs in ſome of the colonies already prevail, and it is ſurely a ſpecies of

ſuicide not to have an army to co-operate with thoſe who are ſtill attached to us. We have already, upon various occaſions, felt the good effects of our American friends, and there is not a doubt, that by vigorous efforts, in two or three more campaigns, ſome of the continental provinces may be ſtrongly inclined to negotiate with our commiſſioners. It is worth the experiment at all hazards.

But the accuſation againſt the Earl of Shelburne upon this point is two-fold. He is charged with duplicity to the Parliament, and treachery to his friends, in having firſt implied an aſſent to American independence, upon the formation of the new miniſtry, and having afterwards reprobated that meaſure as deſtructive of all the intereſts of this country. This charge I admit up to the full point of conviction, and hence deduce all that is neceſſary to eſtabliſh my original poſition, that the Earl of Shelburne was deſtined to be the miniſter of George the Third.

The King naturally loved the object of the American war, however as a man he may be ſhocked at the horrors incidental to military operation. A new miniſtry muſt be formed, and thoſe who overturned the old ſyſtem muſt

in

in grace and decency be, or appear to be, at the head of the new ſyſtem. The Earl of Shelburne is his Majeſty's meſſenger to invite his former friends, and Lord Rockingham, Mr. Fox, &c. are leaders in a plan of government, one of the chief objects of which is to grant American independence. The noble Lord has the darkneſs to hide his real deſigns, as to this great principle in the new adminiſtration (it is no matter to us whether in compliance with any contract in the royal cloſet, or from other motives) and forms a miniſtry which he is convinced muſt burſt to pieces in a few months. Let me appeal to your judgment upon this occaſion, and aſk you, if, upon the face even of this tranſaction, the Earl of Shelburne does not appear to be a man fit to proſper in a court? It is no anſwer, that any man may be a knave, and that the baſeſt blockhead may deceive the brighteſt genius. There is a train of management and myſtery throughout this buſineſs, to which neither envy nor enmity can refuſe applauſe.

Treachery to his friends! a miniſter laughs at the exploded term. It is a language which exiſts only to be deſpiſed. The Earl of Shelburne has the example of one of his preſent colleagues before him, that no tie ſhould bind

bind a ſtateſman; and the leſs temptation to infidelity the greater virtue in the villainy. I ſcarcely need remark to you that I mean the Duke of Grafton. He who grew into power under the patronage of Lord Chatham, and deſerted him the next day. He who cordially united with Lord Rockingham, and abandoned him immediately after. He who by turns ſought the favour, and equally abuſed the confidence of Lord Bute and the Duke of Bedford. He who made Lord North a chancellor of the the Exchequer, and after plunging him into diſaſters, left him to ſhift for himſelf,—even as he betrayed his Sovereign, in the moſt diſtracted hour of his reign. If ſympathy of ſoul can ariſe from ſimilitude of nature, the Duke of Grafton and Lord Shelburne muſt be connected. Both have given a thouſand proofs that they can never differ but in the degrees of deception. Principle cannot ſeparate them, and if in the variety of miniſterial virtues which mark the character of the Duke of Grafton, any one part could, more effectually than another, link himſelf and the Earl of Shelburne cloſe together, it is certainly this—that the Duke, in the affair of Corſica with Choiſeul, made the Earl of Shelburne the moſt contemptible dupe that ever ſigned a King's diſpatch as a ſecretary of ſtate.

And

And it is ſaid the noble Lord can never concur in American independence, without covering himſelf with diſgrace, as he has publicly pronounced that miniſter a traitor who aſſented to ſuch a meaſure. This kind of argument ſeems ſpecious, but it is really falſe. A miniſter's conſiſtency is always accidental. The noble Lord has already begun to ſoften down the rough parts of this political dogma, and upon the laſt day of the laſt ſeſſion of parliament, he did, with a curious ſort of fineſſe, refine it, in ſaying, that he thought 'the ſun of England was ſet that day England ſhould grant independence to America.' The receſs has been employed in melting and meliorating the implicitneſs of this opinion ſtill more, and if he ſhould be forced indeed to recognize the independence of his Majeſty's American dominions, I have not a doubt the noble Earl, when he ſigns this death warrant of the Britiſh empire, will come off in a very courtly and miniſter-like manner.

The noble Earl is ſuppoſed to reſt upon this alternative. If he abandons the American war he diſappoints the King; if he renews it, he deceives the nation. Granting this to be exactly the caſe, a miniſter who is determined to retain his ſituation, may ſurely ſteer a middle way,

way, and avoid the two dangers. He is ſaid (from a terror of rivals out of the cabinet, and to indulge ſome ſtrange ſpirits in the cabinet) to have offered independence to America by Mr. Grenville and Sir Guy Carleton, and that America has refuſed it. America does not fight without an object. Her object is to be independent of the Britiſh crown, and it is ridiculous to think ſhe would not accept what ſhe has been ſeven years ſhedding her blood to obtain, if it were offered her in an unqueſtionable, undeceptive form. I could ſuſpect the noble Lord's cunning to have tendered independence in *ſuch* a ſhape, as infallibly ſecured its rejection; and I could ſuſpect his making this refuſal the inſtrument of a parliamentary ſanction to renew the war. Theſe are conjectures, and time muſt decide. Perhaps the noble Lord has no ſuch view. He may not in this point impoſe upon either the people or the prince. He may neither renew the war, nor yet grant independence. He may let the affairs of America vibrate through another indeciſive year, and prolong his miniſtry, by keeping alive the public ſolicitude. Wealth is valuable, and power is precious. Who but an ideot would reſign while he could retain? There may be ſuch a thing as executing the *King's buſineſs* in a hurry, and cloſing the ſeſſions without any final

final determination. Precedents may be found in abundance. The Earl of Shelburne knows the materials of the Engliſh. They are a ſuſceptive people. It is a nation of confidence, and a fine promiſe has a proud effect. The good ſenſe of the people may be convinced, that it is material to the national honour not to decide upon the American queſtion *yet*. Philip the Second growled for three years, before he acknowledged the independence of Holland. The noble Lord has this wiſe example before him. We have gaped a long time for events, yet time brings about wonders. The principle of our patience is ſtill alive, and ſurely thoſe who truſted Lord North for ſeven years, cannot refuſe one year to the Earl of Shelburne.

The ſecond charge againſt the noble Lord is, that he intends to ſpread the mantle of miniſterial impunity over the Eaſt India delinquents.—This ſort of accuſation leſſens the neceſſity for long defence. The meaſure carries its own vindication along with it. The Earl of Shelburne has not a heart to be cruel; and is there any cruelty more palpable than to ſtrip a man of the fruits of his induſtry? The noble Lord's lenity in this caſe will not only be charitable, but it will be politic. Could any thing be more unwiſe than to diſcourage men from ſcenes

where opulence accompanies victory, and the love of glory is not the *entire* impulſe to action * ?

At a ſeaſon when public proſtitution has weakened the vigor of the human character, and private luxury has blunted the edge of military ardor, a ſtimulus *muſt* be left to animate men into adventures. It is reaſonable, and other countries have felt its benefits. Without queſtion we ſhall hear it ſaid, that the Lord Advocate of Scotland, who ſo nobly begun the career of oriental reformation, cannot, without incurring diſgrace, relax in his efforts to correct the depredations which are a ſtain in the national character, which render the name of Britain execrable in every region of Indoſtan, and which the learned Lord himſelf has often ſolemnly pronounced to deſerve puniſhment, as neceſſary to the ſalvation of all our intereſts in the Eaſt. But an anodyne taken in the nepenthe of St. James's might work a wonderful oblivion, and I am greatly miſtaken in the diſpoſition of Mr. Dundas, if the preſent treaſurer of the navy cannot eaſily perſuade the Lord Advocate of Scotland, to forget all the rapine and barbarities he heard of in the butcherly neighbourhood of Leadenhall-ſtreet.

* Seſe quiſque preda locupletem fore, victorem domum redituram.

I mean

I mean, if the Earl of Shelburne deem it neceſſary, and I ſincerely truſt his compaſſion and policy will not be deterred by thoſe bellowers for juſtice to the Indians, in the Houſe of Commons. Men of wiſdom and virtue, it ſeems, are going out to aſſure the natives of Aſia, that we have an earneſt mind to be honeſt, and rob them no longer. All memory of bills of penalties muſt be waſhed away, and I hope to ſee Sir Thomas Rumbold, one of theſe days, baked up in a batch of Iriſh peers, and Meſſ. Whitehill and Perring, joint plenipotentiaries with Meſſ. Vaughan and Oſwald, in ſecuring the dignity of the Britiſh empire, and reſtoring Europe to her former harmony.

A third reproach upon the Earl of Shelburne is, that he will adviſe the King, to revive his negative to diſagreeable acts of parliament, *if the people inſiſt upon a change in the repreſentation.* And will any man deny that the King has the right, however weak people may diſcourage the exertion of the right, at the very moment it is probable the Parliament may ſpeak the ſenſe of the nation? The conſtitution would not have placed a privilege in his hand for a mere mockery. Great writers have indeed aſſerted, that a King of England may be the moſt abſolute prince in Europe by the nobleſt means, thoſe of reigning in the

hearts of his people. But what is the dictum of theory to the conviction of experiment? The intereſts of King and people muſt be ſeparate, or wherefore all the treaſons, rebellions, civil wars, oppreſſion, violence, and butcheries that have diſtracted the world theſe three thouſand years? The whole tenor of his preſent Majeſty's reign demonſtrates the fact. The laws inveſted the King with the negative; no part of the prerogative is more defined, and if he leaves one of his beſt privileges much longer in a ſtate of inaction, a ſtubborn people may be induced by and by, to diſpute its conſtitutional authority, from the antiquity of its operation.

The Earl of Shelburne is ſuppoſed to have immerſed himſelf, in declaring that "he would "never liſten to the ſound of a King in Ireland." Perhaps the noble Lord has great reliance upon the Iriſh parliament. Experience juſtifies a confidence in that aſſembly, which has appeared to the world more than once, within the laſt two years, to yield in virtue and ſpirit to no ſenate of Greece, Rome, or Britain in their pureſt days, but ſuperior to each, with a defined object, and animated by the firſt of motives, yet before the cloſe of each ſeſſions, to be the moſt ſervile,

vile, baſe, and profligate mob, that ever met to betray the rights, and juggle the underſtanding of a nation.

Lawyers affirm that precedent preſumes repetition. It is poſſible a ſimilar temper of ductility may be ſtill found in the Iriſh parliament; and it is probable the noble Lord depends upon the ſenate of that country to ſecure him from another inconſiſtency. But it needs no mighty labour to prove, that the Iriſh parliament has, more than once, received hints from the Iriſh people. A nation (even without the forms of freedom) may ſometimes feel that political abuſe is carried too far. The ſentiment ſtill better becomes a nation who have at leaſt the ſemblance of liberty. The Iriſh people felt it, and the parliament felt the people. There are qualities in the Britiſh conſtitution which riſe above the groſſeſt corruption, and the people ſometimes ſpeak a language which muſt be underſtood. It is evident that the principles of the Iriſh volunteers, as well as of their friends in the ſenate, is, if not in ſhape, unqueſtionably in ſubſtance, diametrically oppoſite to the Earl of Shelburne. Yet I dare not doubt, if the tide of Iriſh politics run againſt him, that the noble Lord will be completely inſenſible to embaraſſment, in adviſing the King of England to receive

that

that petulant coxcomb the King of Ireland, with all poſſible courteſy, and not feel himſelf at the ſame moment, the leſs a great miniſter.

Mr. Fox is ſaid to be popular, and the Earl of Shelburne execrated in Ireland. It is not my maxim to run a muck at truth, and tilt at facts. I believe the fact is exactly ſo. Mr. Fox, upon opening the Iriſh buſineſs, did certainly deſire, while he officially delivered the deciſion of the cabinet, not to be miſtaken, as one brought into that reſolution by a majority of the adminiſtration, but on the contrary to be underſtood, both in England and Ireland, as giving the naked ſentiments of his heart (at the ſame time that he opened the intentions of the King's council) from the conviction of long thinking and mature reflection. He ſaid the Iriſh ſought no more than '*ſubſtantial juſtice*,' and upon Lord Beauchamp's recommending, as well a repeal of the principle of the 6th of George the Firſt, as of the act itſelf; Mr. Fox heartily concurred in the noble Lord's ſuggeſtion, if he thought that mode would be moſt pleaſing to the Iriſh, adding, that the method adopted was not that which he deemed the beſt, but it was the method demanded by the Iriſh themſelves, and he thought an exact compliance with their wiſhes was the moſt gracious way, in which

their

their rights ſhould be acknowledged by the Engliſh Parliament. Mr. Courtney, from well-meant but miſtaken pride, conſidered the ſuggeſtion of Lord Beauchamp, rather as tending to ſanction the uſurped claim of England, than as neceſſary to emancipate or ſecure the liberties of Ireland.

Much comment has been made upon Mr. Fox's diſtinction between internal and external legiſlation, and I believe he has not been well underſtood upon that point, on either ſide of the channel. His remarks ſeemed to me to have had no other object, than a cenſure of the old adminiſtration, whoſe oppreſſive conduct ſo irritated the people, that in ſhaking off the internal legiſlation of a foreign parliament, they equally reprobated all ideas of the external, which, in the hands of an honeſt miniſtry, they would probably never complain of as an evil; but the folly and injuſtice of the old government had made them impatient until every reſtraint was taken off *. The remark was a ſort of digreſſion, in which not a ſyllable implied the leaſt deſire to retain any aſſumption of power over Ireland, in the Engliſh Parliament. What fell from Mr. Pitt, who ſeconded the

* This ſubject will be more clear to thoſe who know the nature of the *Iriſh free trade*, and *Iriſh ſugar bills*.

motion,

motion, was both untimely and unjuſt, and muſt have ſurprized Mr. Fox, as well as moſt others who heard him.

Theſe circumſtances, united with the tenor of his political conduct for eight years, and the predilection which ſome perſonal knowledge is apt to create, render Mr. Fox a favourite in Ireland. The Earl of Shelburne opened the Iriſh buſineſs in the Houſe of Lords upon the ſame day; but in a manner leſs handſome, leſs liberal, and infinitely leſs acceptable (according to general opinion) in his native country. Certainly his conduct upon that occaſion tended only in a very ſmall meaſure to diminiſh the prejudices of the Iriſh againſt his Lordſhip.

Sir, the Earl of Shelburne lives to illuſtrate vulgar apopthegms more than any other man breathing. It is ſome comfort to be fortified by the moral of old ſayings—No man is a prophet in his country, ſays the proverb; and I will venture to affirm, that his warmeſt advocate (if indeed he has one more ardent than the writer of this letter) will not deny, that the Earl of Shelburne has been long diſliked in the kingdom of Ireland. That his countrymen deal unjuſtly by his Lordſhip there is no doubt, and I will mention one circumſtance to prove that

that they do. It is a trifling anecdote, and as well known in Paris and Vienna, as in Dublin or London.

The founder of the Earl of Shelburne's family was Mr. William Petty, a ſurgeon by profeſſion, and a man of unqueſtioned merit in ſcience. Mr. Petty was appointed to ſurvey the kingdom of Ireland, after that kingdom begun to breathe from civil diſſention. In executing this commiſſion, it is ſuppoſed the ſurveyor forgot to inſert in his muſter-roll ſome portions of land, which he tranſmitted afterwards to his own family, and which his poſterity inherit at this day. The lands were uncultivated, and of courſe of no value. A greater acceſſion of property was acquired to the family in another way.

When Cromwell ravaged the kingdom of Ireland, he had no money to pay his troops, and, inſtead of caſh, conferred by patent upon each ſoldier a certain portion of ground, the birthright of many of the antient nobles of the nation. Cromwell's ſoldiers reſembled Cromwell. He loved to live upon the beſt kind of animal food, they had no ſtomach for vegetable diet, and could never digeſt potatoes. The lands were ſold in conſequence, and a butcher might become a baron,

if he had money. The buyers had mighty bargains. I have ſeen a tract of beautiful ground, containing eighty acres, which was bought for two Engliſh crowns. Of all the purchaſers of theſe patents Mr. Petty was the moſt conſiderable; the extent of lands which he tranſmitted to his family was immenſe; and, ſuch is the tranſition of human affairs, that the old proprietors became tenants to the new purchaſers. Theſe lands were derived from the family of the Pettys, by leaſes of three lives, renewable for ever, upon the tenants paying half a year's rent on the fall of each life. In progreſs of years a great many tenants had, either from neglect, or the remiſſineſs (voluntary or otherwiſe who can decide) of the agent to the eſtates of the Earl of Shelburne, ſuffered ſome of the leaſes to expire, without paying the fine of half a year's rent. The late Earl of Shelburne brought ejectments againſt the tenants upon this omiſſion, the tenants filed bills againſt the Earl of Shelburne, and obtained injunctions to ſtay proceedings at law. The matter was ſuſpended in court, 'when the act of God deprived' * the tenants of the virtues and the talents of their noble landlord. The late Earl went to heaven, and the preſent Earl went to Kerry. The ſon was too

* Part of Lord Shelburne's ſpeech upon the death of Lord Rockingham.

pious

pious to neglect his father's example. He carried on the ſuit with vigour, and during its progreſs in Chancery convened a great number of his tenants, and offered them leaſes of thirty-one years, without any written covenant of renewal, but engaging ſolemnly, upon the ſacred honor of a peer, if thoſe tenants who rejected the propoſal, and truſted to the law, did legally oblige him to give better terms, thoſe very terms to the minuteſt part ſhould be granted, *bona fide*, to the tenants who accepted the propoſal. The offer was irreſiſtible. A preclusion from law expence, with all the poſſible benefits of law, the Earl of Shelburne, young, and then unmarked by any infamy, which made it very improper to place a confidence in his ſolemn voluntary vow. Several of the tenants acceded in conſequence.

The Iriſh Chancery ſome time after, upon an equitable compoſition as to the fines, decided in favour of the tenants, and the Earl of Shelburne was compelled to renew, according to the letter of the original leaſes. Thoſe who accepted his Lordſhip's propoſal, demanded the advantages of their fellow-tenants, conformably to the ſpirit of their compact with the noble Lord.

* *I do not find it in the bond*, ſaid his Lordſhip,

* Shylock in the Merchant of Venice.

The Earl of Shelburne knew of no written article of legal compulſion, and abſolutely refuſed to renew: the tenants went home, crying, 'we have not acted like wiſe men!'

Why ſhould the noble Lord renew the leaſes upon the obligation of a verbal contract? he may read the ſtatute-book up to the laſt volume and find no penalty incurred, no expreſs law violated—nothing to cenſure him—nothing to coerce. It would have been idiotical, if, from any crawſickneſs of conſcience, or honor, he had renewed. The lands under the old leaſes do not produce a ſixth part of the current value of ſimilar eſtates in Ireland. Who could be mad enough to mind a promiſe to men with ſuch names as *Mlaghling o'Muynighane—Philimy Mackcullacotho—Moroogha mac Lughullugha?*——Or who could dread that ſuch men, creeping through life in a neglected corner of the moſt diſtant county of Ireland, would ever come forward with any impotent efforts, to fix a ſtain upon the unſullied probity of the Earl of Shelburne?

* This is a trifling incident, and I record it only to ſhew you, that the ſame principle of

* The writer of this letter undertakes to *prove* any man who ſhould contradict the preceding anecdote *a liar*.

deep

deep management, and provident ſagacity, which inſpirits the public conduct of the Earl of Shelburne, accompanies him through the leſſer concerns of private life; and as one proof among the many thouſands already in the public knowledge, that the noble Lord was perfectly right in declaring (when he did intimate to the Houſe of Lords the King's intention of his ſucceeding the Marquiſs of Rockingham at the head of the treaſury) that 'for his Majeſty's favour his intire reliance was upon *his own integrity*.'

When the Duke de Sully came to his inheritance, he found the family eſtate of Roſny in the moſt deplorable condition, and his tenants the moſt wretched in all France. By humanity and induſtry he made the eſtate in a few years the moſt fertile and elegant, his tenants the moſt contented and comfortable in the whole kingdom. A friend aſked him, upon his becoming miniſter to Henry the Fourth, whether he meant to manage France and Frenchmen as he did the eſtate and tenants of Roſny? The Duke's reply was, that his practice as a miniſter ſhould be preciſely upon the ſame principle that he was a landlord. He kept his word to the minuteſt part. France was the moſt feeble and wretched kingdom in Europe upon the Duke de Sully's acceſſion to power,

—he

—he made her the moſt flouriſhing and formidable monarchy of Chriſtendom. The Earl of Shelburne found his tenants in eaſe and happineſs. He left them in indigence and miſery. No man can ſuſpect that I would by this draw any preſumptive inference againſt the noble Lord's adminiſtration. His recorded virtues would render me as ridiculous as my argument would be unreaſonable, if I attempted it.

You, Sir, are an Iriſh landlord, and as your treatment of your tenants has been exactly upon the plan of the Duke de Sully, I am inclined to think an adoption of the Earl of Shelburne for a model, might greatly improve your treaſury;—but I have ſome fears that his example will not eaſily tempt you to heap calamities upon your tenants in Ireland, even though the product of ſo infamous an avarice (inſtead of making you the baſeſt fellow in the nation) ſhould only continue to honour you with the title of being one of the beſt gentlemen in Britain.

For the above reaſon, and for reaſons ſimilar, the Earl of Shelburne is obnoxious in Ireland. In that quarter he has certainly great impediments to encounter. But if the Iriſh Commons, upon whom he has, and upon whom I have,

have, great dependence, ſhould not anſwer his purpoſe, the Lords, who indulged him with annihilating the revenue officers bill, cannot fail. A congenial temper of commodious facility prevails between the peers of Ireland, and their noble brethren of England. Never were two aſſemblies more capable. But if it were poſſible, that moſt virtuous and venerable body ſhould deviate into a forgetfulneſs of their old flexibility, the noble Lord is not deſtitute of other ſources of ſupport in that country. The rights of the Iriſh nation have been often enveloped in the ſplendor of the Iriſh court, and whatever influence the acknowledged genius of Lord Temple will fall ſhort of creating, may be ſupplied by Lady Temple's well-dreſt Mercuries. If the Earl of Shelburne's efforts to ſeduce Mr. Flood, in his late viſit to London, have been ineffectual (which by the way I do not anſwer for, tho' it is not probable he has been ſucceſsful) the noble Lord has a juſt confidence in the Earl of Nugent's * popularity. The Earl of Nugent is almoſt as great a favourite in Ireland, as the Earl of Shelburne; and, I have no doubt, both the one and the other would be as well received in that kingdom, as Velaſques was in Portugal, or Verres would have

* Lady Temple's virtuous father.

been,

been, if he returned to Sicily. The meaſure of the Iriſh fencibles was a bold attempt, but unhappily too palpable. I fear that will no more ſucceed than the ſcheme of ſhips from the Engliſh counties. It is a great misfortune to this adminiſtration, that the Iriſh people of late have felt *themſelves*, and the greateſt evil of all is, that they ſeem to know the Earl of Shelburne completely.

SENECA ſpeaks of ſomebody who wrote a treatiſe upon the benefits a man may receive from his enemies. The writer alluded to by the philoſopher, ſhould have been a politician. It is the criterion of a miniſter to make uſe of his foes as well as his friends; and the noble Earl, whoſe cauſe I am endeavouring to vindicate, yields to no mortal in the full practice of this beſt of maxims. From his foes (the Northites) he got a principle, and from his friends (whom I ſhall call Foxites) he got a theatre to put this principle into action. The Foxites overturned the Northites, and the Earl of Shelburne became a miniſter in conſequence. He had a ſort of Ottoman virtue, and could bear no brother near the throne. He would be a Turk—nay, he would be a Chriſtian to get power. He made it impoſſible for the Foxites to remain in the cabinet, and ſent them to erect a fortreſs

for

for the reception of General Conway, when the General, in his turn, ſhould be a fugitive from Paradiſe, unleſs indeed he wiſh to languiſh between the elements, like a fallen angel in Pandemonium.

How far the noble Lord has got a principle from his foes, hear the aſſertions of Mr. Fox, uncontradicted by two of his colleagues, at that moment preſent*: 'there are things that operate upon a man's belief, which are not demonſtrable. I cannot abſolutely prove to this houſe, what I am in my own mind convinced of—that the Earl of Shelburne has views inimical to this country; but this I will ſay, that if the late ſecretary at war had ſat in the King's council, he could not more aſſiduouſly have inculcated that ſyſtem of unconſtitutional principles which we have been ſo many years endeavouring to overthrow.' Doubts are beſt decided by analogy, and the people of England will not be extremely puzzled for Mr. Fox's meaning, when he aſſimilates the Earl of Shelburne with Mr. Charles Jenkinſon.

Sir, if I could be perſuaded that this imputation of Mr. Fox affected the Earl of Shelburne, I might argue like a lawyer, and ſay,

* On the 9th of July in the Houſe of Commons.

that a bare aſſertion comes far wide of proof, and conſequently of conviction. But I ſhould be a lawyer indeed to quibble, where common ſenſe is more effectual. It is upon this very ſyſtem of political thinking, which Mr. Fox ſo loudly reprobates, that I build the chief defence of the noble Lord.

Idem per alterum is true wiſdom—How can I tell, or how can you tell, by what variation of manner the ſame end may be purſued, or by what dexterity of miniſterial diſguiſe the GREAT ORIGINAL OBJECT may be concealed from the vulgar eye. That object which begun with Lord Bute—which the Duke of Bedford adopted as the only channel of grace—which Lord Chatham and Lord Rockingham diſdained to countenance—which the Duke of Grafton aſpired to eſtabliſh—which he delivered to Lord North—which Lord North was forced to abandon—which the Earl of Shelburne graſps to his boſom, and will, if poſſible, depoſit in its long-expected ſanctuary. The ſhape may be changed, but I have no doubt of the ſimilitude of ſubſtance. Thoſe who are moſt friendly, and thoſe who are but lukewarm, to the noble Lord, have ſtrong ſuſpicions. His opponents to a man are decided. Therefore I have ſaid that the Northites gave him a principle.

That

That the Foxites gave him a ſcene, is a poſition which admits no queſtion. The noble Lord thought his dignity ſomewhat diminiſhed by continual parliamentary exertion, and imagined that the ſeldomer he appeared, he was like another Bolingbroke*, 'gazed at like a comet.' Upon the Duke of Richmond he left the burthen of oppoſition, and never did man more faithfully or more firmly perſiſt in political projects than the noble Duke. The Duke of Richmond debates as a Swiſs mountaineer fights for his liberty. He hits an adverſary with every weapon; nor is it a flaſh, nor a figure, nor a flouriſh, that can diſpoſſeſs him. I have ſeen the noble Duke loſe even his legs in argument, and like another Witherington he has battled the enemy upon his ſtumps, until prelates, and lay peers, and law peers were forced to ſeek an ungallant victory in the coup de main of a diviſion.

Upon this noble perſon reſted chiefly the expoſition of the old ſyſtem in the Houſe of Lords. The Earl of Shelburne indeed came down upon nice occaſions, with a well-dreſſed ſpeech. The ſpecies of eloquence called *reply*, ſeems not to be much admired by the noble

* Henry the Fourth.

Lord. Reply ſubjects moſt ſpeakers to ſlip into inadvertencies. The Earl of Shelburne ſeldom repeated his ſpeech in the Houſe, without diſcovering that ſort of *deſign*, which I think fits him for his preſent ſtation beſt of any other man.

For inſtance, he came down upon the firſt day of the laſt ſeſſions to ſhed a patrician tear upon the calamity of Lord Cornwallis, and whilſt he reprobated the miniſtry for carrying on the American war, pronounced a florid panegyric upon the King for implying a deſire to purſue the very war he affected to execrate.—Obſerve this fact, Sir, and tho' you may deny candor to the ſenator, the praiſe of cunning at leaſt is due to the ſtateſman.

The Earl of Shelburne likewiſe came down upon the attack on the French convoy in December by Admiral Kempenfelt, not ſo much to abuſe the Admiralty for ignorance of the ſize of the French fleet, as to convey a proud idea of his own information from the continent of Europe.

The noble Earl alſo came down upon the affair of Mr. Iſaac Haynes—and whilſt Lord Huntingdon attacked the Duke of Richmond, on

on the one ſide, with the loveliest aſſemblage of features that ever ſoftened the rigor of an enemy, and the Lord Chancellor ſurrounded him, upon the other ſide, with Grotius and Puffendorff, and Cocteius; the Earl of Shelburne afforded his noble friend the Duke no other aſſiſtance, than pronouncing an eulogium upon the greatneſs of Lord Huntingdon's anceſtry (an information perfectly new to every man above and below the bar) and directing a moſt faſtidious frown at Lord Stormont, with theſe important words—"upon this day, the 4th of February, no ſyſtem of conduct appears to be formed by theſe great men." Lord Stormont is any man's match at a ſtare of emptineſs. He looked back upon the noble Earl like a gilded calf. The Earl of Shelburne continued almoſt in the words of the poet, 'A nation's fate depends on you'——'Cockadoodle do,' replied Lord Stormont, with an erectneſs of eye-brow, and loftineſs of forehead, which would not have diſgraced the elder Veſtris, when he receives the crown from the hands of Creon.

Through theſe, and through all the parliamentary operations of the Earl of Shelburne, you muſt trace a *plan*. Succeſs conſtitutes the merit of all actions, and his muſt therefore be called

called a judicious plan. He looked for the hour, it was ſlow, but it was not the leſs certain. Kings *are* the beſt judges what quality of ſtateſmen are moſt ſuitable to their cabinets. It is petulant in Monteſquïeu to ſay, 'That after all he cannot help having ſome pity for ſovereigns, who are generally ſurrounded from the cradle to the grave, with knaves and ſycophants.' It is eaſy to be eloquent, and men in their cloſets may rail at the inſidious policy and treacherous arts of ſtateſmen, but inſidious policy and treacherous arts are neceſſary to a government!

The Earl of Shelburne is a man who muſt proſper in a court. He knows when to relax, and when to tighten the line. Look at his conduct upon the late volunteer bill; 'You ought to have power to force the people,' ſaid Lord Stormont——'I admit your principle,' replied the Earl of Shelburne; 'Government, for true political uſes, *ſhould* have a power of compelling the ſubject. Your maxim is excellent; but we muſt reſort to gentler methods. The policy would be better to adopt bolder means, but this is not the ſeaſon.' And if you will enquire the particulars of the progreſs of this bill, I believe you will find, that the

the Earl of Shelburne admitted the greater part of Lord Stormont's amendments, and recognized *all* his principles of government.—Perhaps Sir Charles Turner would cry out, *Alius et idem.*

This neceſſarily leads me into a ſhort conſideration of another part of this noble Lord's character. It may ſeem ſtrange to ſay, that the man who is deſtitute of political conſiſtency, ſhould be endued with political courage. Yet I think the noble Lord in his own perſon abſolutely reconciles this apparent paradox. I do believe he has ſome ſhare of boldneſs. It is to this Mr. Burke alluded, when he affirmed in the Houſe of Commons, that he thought it twenty times more dangerous to truſt the Earl of Shelburne with power, than the old miniſtry; whilſt Lord Mahon kept writhing at Mr. Burke, like a gladiator. 'Will you lift this Marius, ſaid Mr. Burke, over the Metelli, over all the good and honeſt men in England? Will you put power into the hands of Sylla? Yes certainly, I would ſay (were I a member of that houſe) I would truſt power into the hands of Lord Shelburne, who does I muſt confeſs reſemble Sylla. *Ad ſimulanda negotia altitudo ingenii incredibilis, multarum rerum et maxime*

maxime pecuniæ largitor, is Salluſt's portrait; and yet I would truſt power with the noble Lord—Beſides thinking with Mr. Burke, that the littleneſs of manners, and mediocrity of character, which are the types of the preſent generation, forbad exactly the effects of the confidence in Sylla—I know it is extremely poſſible that the Earl of Shelburne may not turn this power into a fatal uſe. I know it was poſſible when power was conferred upon Sylla, that he might not deluge Rome with the blood of her beſt citizens. It is ſaid, that Sylla had a ſtrong mind *not* to enter upon the bloody buſineſs of the proſcriptions. If he did not deem it neceſſary to his own conſequence and ſafety, he would probably not have murdered thoſe heaps of Romans that make their hiſtory horrible.—In that reſpect the firſt law of nature was his ſanction.—But ſurely it is ſtretching apprehenſion too far, entirely to compare the men, and the ſituations—our own pure unſanguinary ſcaffolds do not at all countenance theſe fine apprehenſions.

This country, I maintain it, wants a bold miniſter. Could its hiſtory have been ſullied with the violence of June 80, had this noble Lord been at the head of affairs? How did the Earl of Shel-

Shelburne act upon that occaſion?—Sir, with the diſcernment of a man fitted by nature and art to be a miniſter, he declared, '*he did not doubt, but government itſelf was at the bottom of the riot*;' and he ſtated an inſtance to illuſtrate his conjecture.

He naturally concluded the riot could never have grown into ſuch an alarming magnitude, unleſs it had the countenance of adminiſtration. Had that noble Lord been miniſter, no judge would have been obliged to torture ſtatutes, or hang fifteen ragamuffins upon a ſingle indictment. Sir, there was a mode of ſuppreſſion more obvious—a puniſhment more convenient—Not a good citizen will heſitate to confeſs, that, to vindicate the national order, ten thouſand men ſhould have fallen, as the victims of that violence; and I am forward to aſſert, that the inertneſs of the army upon that occaſion will be an eternal ſtain upon the free government of this country.

The Earl of Shelburne was juſtified in ſuſpecting that adminiſtration. To diſcredit a miniſter is proverbial. There are times and circumſtances which forbad a confidence in any man. *Ne Catoni quidem credendum.* I will not truſt even Mr. Fox upon this occaſion, ſaid Sir

George Saville. I muſt have an explicit aſſurance concerning the American war. But whether the adminiſtration of the year 80 were guilty, or not, theſe concluſions are fair.—Firſt, that their imbecility upon the affair of the riots will be a blot upon our annals.—Secondly, that extraordinary powers ſhould be placed in the hands of a miniſter, and that the miniſter be a bold one. The Earl of Shelburne will, I truſt, prove himſelf a bold miniſter. My only concern is, that our niggard conſtitution has ſhamefully conſtrained the authorities of his office; but I have much reliance upon the Parliament.

Without enduing the Parliament with the attribute of omnipotence, in imitation of Sir William Blackſtone, it is yet certainly competent to remedy that fatal defect in our civil form, which very often binds up the hands of a miniſter, and only leaves him the mortification of ſpeculating in private, what he dares not publicly execute. Does any man doubt the temper of the Senate? Is any man mad enough to imagine, that the temporary triumphs, the partial victories of laſt March, have entirely annihilated the great *principle* of Parliament—the great principle of human nature? Corruption can only die of a ſupernatural death. The ſucceſs of thoſe, who, in the laſt winter, barbarouſly

barouſly checked the ſpring that gives energy and animation to political movements in this country did certainly aſtoniſh the world; yet their victory was dearly bought, and no miracle accompanied their glory. The ſtamina are yet in a ſtate of wholeneſs. They only wait a little cultivation to vegetate in full fecundity, and bloom out again in their antient vigor and mellowneſs. Human nature is not very ſubject to extraordinary converſions, and Jugurtha and Sir Robert Walpole will ſtill maintain their ſtation amongſt moral philoſophers. *Omnes mortales pecunia aggrediantur.*—Men may think, and ſtammer, and ſtutter, and doubt, but they will decide after all, and they will decide with the ruling paſſion. *Vicit in avido ingenio pravum conſilium.*

Was the great and ſhining feature of Parliament impaired or altered upon the motion relative to Mr. Rigby laſt June? So far from it, that the houſe, which for two months before exhibited a ſolitary aſpect of depopulated benches, could ſcarcely contain the crowd of ſenators, who came accoutred with wry faces, 'like Herod's hang-dogs in old tapeſtry,' to give a home thruſt to that impious miſſionary, who threatened ruin to their antient tenets, and meditated the deſtruction of their old religion.

—Perhaps a final thruſt—The report of a diſſolution was then current. It is probable the adminiſtration of that day imagined the nation would not be the worſe if a certain claſs of ſenators returned to their counting-houſes, and manſion-ſeats near the capital. But I will venture to affirm that the Earl of Shelburne has no ſuch deſign. The genius of the preſent Parliament is well known. Characters more capable are not eaſily found. Much addreſs is neceſſary to ſeduce a virgin—the ſtrumpet yields to every libertine that pays for her proſtitution. The Earl of Shelburne is convinced, it is not every good man in the Lower Houſe, who can twice in two years afford the ſum of four thouſand pounds for a ſeat in parliament, eſpecially when contractors bills, &c. do apparently preclude him from ſerving his country in the way moſt ſuitable to his own wiſhes. From *you* at leaſt I ſhall not hear, 'that the parliament will not dare to betray the intereſt of the nation,' I have your own words publicly delivered in the ſenate, how far it is poſſible for a parliament to go to the very exceſs of political infamy. In the year 1770 you aſſerted, '*that the majority of the Houſe of Commons were traitors*'—and when I am convinced that the preſent parliament have given ſo many proofs of ſuperior conſiſtency, wiſdom,

wiſdom, and virtue, that their integrity ſhould not be queſtioned, it will be a greater happineſs to me to place a confidence in their honeſty, than to live in a perſuaſion that they can equal the profligacy of any of their predeceſſors.

The bills paſſed laſt ſeſſions, for excluding certain members, and for reſtraining certain miniſters, are ſuppoſed by ſome good people to defeat the poſſibility of corruption. It cannot be denied that theſe bills render political ſeduction a more difficult taſk. But where is the man of truth, and plain ſenſe, who ſhall affirm that corruption is impracticable? Some of the bills are worded with all imaginable caution, and it muſt be admitted, that a Firſt Lord of the Treaſury cannot, with very great amplitude, practiſe the old trade of parliamentary corruption, without committing a perjury. But ſurely even this is a trifling impediment in the great career of ſo aſpiring a miniſter as the Earl of Shelburne—a political oath at the Treaſury ſhould be as much a matter of form as a commercial oath at the Cuſtom-houſe; '*a politician has always twa conſciences.*' There are ingenious modes of evading any law. It is the glory of Engliſh judges (tho' a great foreign writer has reproached them with it as a crime) to attend to the *letter*, and conſider the *intent* of

of an act of parliament as a ſecondary object. Can a miniſter have any example more auguſt, any ſanction more venerable, than the unſpotted practice of Britiſh judges? And ſurely no ſtateſman can be ſuch a botch at logical diſtinctions, as not to find a convenient poſition to entrench himſelf behind the *letter*, whilſt the *ſpirit* of a law might waſte away, like the ſpirit of Plato in his viſionary republic.

From an expedient management of the parliaments, the Earl of Shelburne will, I truſt, obtain, not only a great enlargement of power, but a ſanction for ſtretches of power, when neceſſary. Weak men ſuppoſe that the Lower Houſe cannot, through any temptation whatever, ſupport his adminiſtration, inaſmuch as the noble Lord has been at all times wantonly forward to diſparage the democratic branch of the conſtitution; and even in the laſt ſeſſions, has taunted that body with the epithets of 'a petty ariſtocracy, a ſeptennial nobility,' &c.—When the Earl of Shelburne affects the *proper* feelings of the Houſe of Commons, I have not a doubt they will ſhew a very *natural* ſpirit. A point of avarice could not fail to create a conteſt, but I cannot ſuſpect them of ſo improvident a revenge as quarrelling with a Firſt Lord of the Treaſury, upon a mere queſtion of ambition.

And

And this is the golden hour of opportunity for a great miniſter to perpetrate great deſigns. Facility in general accompanies felicity, and no man can ſay that the Engliſh do not ſeem to be a happy people. There was a cowardly ſenſe of danger in the Roman republic, which we diſdain to feel. They had confidence, it is true, in the midſt of diſtreſs, but they were the moſt ſhamefully apprehenſive people in the world. The hiſtorian tells you, that Rome ſhook to her center, upon the loſs of a battle, even in Africa. *Metus atque meror civitatem invaſere, pars dolere pro gloria imperii, pars timere libertati, omnes triſtitia invaſit, feſtinare, trepidare, afflictare ſeſe, omnia pavere, ſuperbia atque deliciis omiſſis.* You obſerve, Sir, that they feared even foreign calamity had endangered their domeſtic liberty, and conſidered their fame and freedom as blended together.

But with *us*—there is a noble negligence, a ſort of generous contempt, and illuſtrious indifference to public meaſures and incidents, that tho' three thouſand veteran troops were captured, three million of ſubjects loſt to the crown, and thirteen colonies diſmembered from the empire, all is frolic, and mirth, and gaiety —The commerce of perfumes at leaſt does not ſlacken; nor is the elegant and liberal art of a French

French dancer the leſs ſure of the diſtinguiſhing patronage of the Engliſh gentry. (Theſe remarks are vulgar, but who can diſpute them?) Pluto and Epicurus ſeem our only deities. Review the opera-houſe upon the ruin of Cornwallis—you would imagine the temple of Janus had been ſhut up, and that Mars was only engaged in cuckolding Vulcan: while the Britiſh theatre was perhaps entirely deſerted, and Shakeſpeare and Congreve abandoned for Simonet and Metaſtaſio.

Our glory is, that what others have done from expediency, we do from election. Lewis the Fourteenth blinded the city of Paris with tournaments and feſtivities, at the very time his own and Madam Maintenon's jewels were ſold by public auction at Amſterdam.—His gaiety was artful, ours is entirely natural. Royal perſonages are very active in our paſtimes likewiſe, but whom I ſincerely acquit of having Lewis the Fourteenth for a model, or of being impelled by any political motive under heaven.

Such, or nearly ſuch, was Rome in the days of Sylla *—completely ſuch in the days of

* Urbem venalem, et mature perituram, ſi emptorem invenerit.

Cæſar.

Cæſar. Such was Thebes, and ſuch was Athens in the time of Philip. That Athens, where the bare ſound of appropriating to the calamities of the ſtate, a ſmall part of the ſtock-purſe for public amuſements, created an abſolute rebellion.

The ſubject, Sir, upon which I addreſs you, contains much matter, and a vaſt complexity of argument. It imperceptibly leads to digreſſion. I fear that all I have ſaid is not appoſite to the plan of defending Lord Shelburne; but I have not deviated wantonly, and ſhall be more in order for the remainder of this letter.

THE ANTAGONISTS of the Earl of Shelburne will no doubt arrogate an infinite merit to themſelves for having acted towards the people preciſely as they engaged to act. Great promiſes leſſen credit, ſaid Mr. Burke. *Multa fidem promiſſa levant.* They have a right to ſay—we gave juſtice to Ireland, and ſhe gave us in return an unuſual gratitude *, an acceſſion of ſtrength equal to ten ſhips of the line.—Had our advice been accepted an open and honourable conduct ſhould have been held towards

* If Ireland is not ſatisfied, her diſcontent is not chargeable upon the Rockingham adminiſtration. They recognized her rights exactly *in the way ſhe preſcribed.*

America. How far we were right in the policy to be adopted with her, look to the effect of the negotiations at Paris, to the rejection of all overtures from Sir Guy Carleton, and the refuſal of a paſſport for Philadelphia to his ſecretary—We ſhould have acted to all the dependencies of the empire with equity and liberality. The only mode of regaining the confidence of our fellow-ſubjects in the different parts of the world, is to treat them as the citizens of a free ſtate, and not as the ſlaves of tyranny. *Melius viſum amicos quam ſervos querere, tutiuſque rati volentibus, quam coactis imperitare.*—We gave the nation a contractors bill, a revenue-officers bill, a civil liſt bill *.—Out of office, we reprobated the corruption of parliament; in office we exhibited a ſpectacle, new in the hiſtory of our country. *The miniſter of the day* (Mr. Fox) *decrying the influence of the crown, and ſupporting the power of the people upon the treaſury bench*—We went into government with pure hearts, we left it with pure hands.—Theſe are the methods by which we give the lie to thoſe who called it unconſtitutional in Mr. Fox to appear upon a Huſtings in open day, to recommend a man of tried probity to the free choice of his conſtituents. If they were in-

* I will venture to ſay, that nine out of ten of the revilers of this bill never read it.

deed

deed enemies to Mr. Fox who traduced him upon this occaſion, and ſaid, ‘ How would *he* have bellowed had Lord North appeared upon a huſtings?’—it ſerves only to prove an old poſition, that a fooliſh foe, is a real friend. I think Mr. Fox hardly needs to have better advocates than ſuch revilers. Their political conduct leaves no doubt of *their* regard for the conſtitution. The tenor of their whole lives puts it out of all queſtion.

Lord North upon a huſtings!—He, who for twelve years ſupported the moſt pernicious ſyſtem of government that ever marked the fate of any unhappy country, not excepting any period of the moſt rapid decline of the Roman empire. He who, in ſeven years, diſmembered the moſt powerful ſtate of the modern world, by the moſt univerſal ſyſtem of corruption that diſhonours the hiſtory of Britain. Sir Robert Walpole, in the infamous glory of his moſt extended turpitude, yields as much to Lord North, as the wealth of the ſtate, in the time of the former, exceeded the riches of government under the latter miniſter. Was there one queſtion of public policy decided in either Houſe, during his adminiſtration, but by the palpable influence of poſitive bribery? Was there a county or city election, in which he

did not interfere? Was there a contemptible borough in the whole kingdom which he did not purchaſe, or endeavour to purchaſe? Is it any ſatisfaction that he was not *in perſon* upon the various theatres of corruption? Lord North's body is unwieldy, but a Firſt Lord of the Treaſury has myſtical faculties. His influence is omnipreſent. How did he act in the very county of which he is Lord Lieutenant? His faithful Commons (for no partial diſtribution of a loan had then made them faithleſs) acquitted him, it is true, of having directly interfered. But I appeal to the underſtanding of the public. Was there in this nation one man of honour and good ſenſe, who did not in his conſcience believe that Maurice Lloyd went to Milbourne Port, to undermine the intereſt of Temple Luttrell by the deſire of Lord North? I ſay, *was* there? Becauſe the matter has been ſince put out of all queſtion.

That only one acknowledged minion ſhould be returned at the general election, was as neceſſary to the public credit of Lord North, as it was requiſite to the private purſe of Mr. Medlicott that he ſhould (when all was quiet) accept the Chiltern hundreds. But the train of meaſures, by which Mr. Luttrell's petition miſcarried, was baſe and infamous beyond all conception.

ception. I do not impeach the committee. Perhaps they decided up to the ſpirit of their oaths. The ſhameful arts practiſed to defeat the petitioner were probably out of their knowledge, but they ſhould be recorded for public information, and parliamentary example. The moſt ſhameful advantage was taken of the diſtreſſes of an unfortunate gentleman, and the people at large will be ſhocked to hear that a witneſs *, amply ſufficient to overthrow the opponents of Mr. Luttrell, was ſecreted in a houſe at Lambeth, until the petition was decided, and afterwards recompenſed with a generoſity that far exceeded the abilities of Mr. Medlicott, and not at all diſgraceful to the munificence of the treaſury.

That the claſs of politicians, who have made it a merit in Lord North, not to appear upon a huſtings, ſhould traduce Mr. Fox for doing ſo, is a circumſtance which I will take upon me to ſay, *he* will never lament. Such enmities never fail to be uſeful. But whilſt Engliſhmen have hearts, and hands to execute the wiſhes of their hearts, a miniſter like Lord North will not dare to appear upon a huſtings in the city of Weſtminſter. And if Mr. Fox

* This creature's name is *Hyde*.

(who

(who has overturned that abominable ſyſtem of univerſal corruption, the political Hercules who deſtroyed the political Hydra) ſhould ever tread in the footſteps of Lord North, as a miniſter of this country, I wiſh, when he appears at a place of election, he may meet a fate as much worſe than the death of Raviliac, as the aſſaſſin of a good king, is a more innocent character, than the murderer of a glorious conſtitution.

The antagoniſts of the Earl of Shelburne will aſk, What has the noble Lord done for the people? Nothing—but he has promiſed every thing. 'Theſe bills (ſays Mr. Fox) are pigmies to his promiſes, but they are giants to his performances.' They will urge further, can the Earl of Shelburne ſhew his face, convicted as he ſtands of flagrant falſehood, as to Mr. Fox's reſignation, by the according voices of Mr. Burke, Mr. Fox, General Conway, Lord John Cavendiſh, Lord Keppel, the Duke of Richmond, and indeed by his own confeſſion? How can that miniſter retain his ſtation, who has not the confidence of any part of his Majeſty's dominions, who is accuſed by all his enemies, and whom no friend dares to vindicate? On the 9th of July he was ſtigmatized in the Houſe of Commons,

as

as a miniſter without merit or genius, as a man without truth or fidelity, and not a ſoul roſe to ſpeak in his behalf, but one impotent individual, at the cloſe of the debate, whoſe defence was damnation. To thoſe I have but one anſwer. So long as he maintains his preſent ſituation, juſt ſo long I allow him merit. The miniſter who promiſed every thing, and performed nothing—who overturned his friends, and increaſed his own power at the ſame moment, is in my opinion the true genius of miniſter. You may ſay, it is treachery, and rail at cunning. You may quote Bacon and Bolingbroke againſt it, ſay it is left-handed—it is the low mimic of wiſdom—it defeats itſelf in the end, and ſo on: yet, Sir, I affirm, it is the great and ſuperior talent for a miniſter of theſe times.

The noble Earl is fond of cant terms. I will give him one which has been popular in the nation ever ſince the 9th of laſt July. It is called a day *famous for his infamy*. The miniſter of England reprobated, in the Houſe of Parliament, with all that can degrade a man and a politician, without a defender, without a friend. And yet who is it can poſitively ſay that there may not be, after all this, in the world (though not in Kerry or Wiltſhire) ſome

ſome perſon who *can* ſpeak well of the Earl of Shelburne? A bad character ſhould not be the ruin of a miniſter. Mazarin was the idol of the court, at the time he was deteſted all over France, and obliged to quit the kingdom. I think in principle he reſembles the Earl of Shelburne,--for ſimilarity of fortune, I affect no prophecy. If the Earl of Shelburne is hated, the people is giddy, and I do not deſpair to ſee a plenty of panegyriſts ſtart up even in the Houſe of Commons this next ſeſſions. The noble Lord, as Mr. Lee remarked, is in the way of making friends—and will not, I am ſure, miſapply the patronage of the treaſury upon this ſcore. His friends too will have one great advantage over the panegyriſts of Lord North. A lover's tongue never faulters ſo much, as before the object of his adoration. I have ſeen the blooming Mr. St. John languiſh down even while he caſt the thurible, with the ſmoaking incenſe; and many a time, when the gracious divinity was ſnuffing up the perfume, has the prieſt fainted under the weight of the ſacrifice. The Earl of Shelburne's friends, unawed by his preſence in the Lower Houſe, will have none of theſe embarraſſments to encounter. Flattery ſucceeds beſt in fiction (according to Waller, who was certainly a judge) and I hope to hear many a

ſplendid

ſplendid eulogium upon the Earl of Shelburne, this winter in the Houſe of Commons.

With ſome people Colonel Barré is accuſable for his ſilence upon the 9th of July; but I can well acquit him—To *him* at leaſt it was a trying hour, and it was natural the patron ſhould be abſorbed in the penſion. I have got theſe three thouſand two hundred pounds a year, for twenty years laborious duty in parliament, ſaid Colonel Barré. That's wrong, replies the Earl of Shelburne, the next day in the Houſe of Peers. The Colonel gets this penſion, becauſe all the good *I* have already done, and all the bleſſings I ſhall yet bring upon this nation derive from him. I am in the way of a Meſſiah, and 'OWE ALL TO HIM THAT SENT ME.'——My conduct, ſays the Colonel again, upon General Warrants in the Houſe deprived me of my rank in the army, my government and military emoluments. This penſion is given me as a compenſation.—Wrong, replies the Earl of Shelburne: He gets this penſion as a bargain for Mr. Burke's getting the paymaſterſhip. Lord Rockingham was the propoſer of it—That's a flat falſhood, cries Mr. Burke (who has ſometimes a downright plain mode of talking) I appeal to Lord John Cavendiſh.—The matter originated with Lord Shelburne,

ſays Lord John. I never heard of its being in lieu of the paymaſterſhip.—The noble Earl talked of this penſion, cries Mr. Fox, before the miniſtry was abſolutely formed.—This and all he has ſaid yeſterday concerning my reſignation, are no more nor leſs than direct and palpable deviations from truth, and I ſhall prove them ſo.

The fact is ſimply this—Colonel Barré derived neither his government nor military emoluments originally from length of ſervice, nor eminence of merit in the army. He owed them, exactly as he does his penſion, to his conduct in the Houſe of Commons, when his friends were in adminiſtration. He oppoſed a ſucceeding miniſtry, and loſt his places. I am not going to juſtify his removal, but every man knows, this very policy has been the general practice of moſt adminiſtrations in this country. And if the Colonel's claim to a penſion were really examined and then admitted, two hundred men might ſtart up to-morrow with equal rights, upon the ſame principle. A few arguments of this ſort would have greatly puzzled the Colonel.

I agree with you, Mr. Barré, 'that honour has its delicacies.' You ſpoke emphatically. 'I

vow

vow to God, if there is one honeſt ſenſible man in this houſe, who would ſay that I did not deſerve this penſion, I would never take a ſhilling of it.' Truth is one of the lovelieſt qualities of honour. And I aſk you as a man of honour, do you believe there was one honeſt ſenſible man in that Houſe (thoſe who concurred in the meaſure excepted) who in his conſcience thought you deſerved that penſion, ſituated as you then were, and circumſtanced as this unhappy country is at this time? If you ſay *Yes*, I ſay *No*. I do affirm that it was not the wiſh of that Houſe, nor is it of the nation, that you ſhould get a penſion, whilſt they who had ſuperior claims, and ſuperior neceſſities, never received, nor ever ſought (to their honour be it ſpoken) a ſingle pound. There is no ground for cenſure upon the ſeceding party as to this: a proviſion for an old friend (however they may ſilently diſapprove the meaſure) was too ungracious a cauſe for conteſt. But the fact is, that the power of this country was in the hands of the Earl of Shelburne, and every incident ſince the moment he ſaw the King laſt March, to this hour, confirms it. Mr. Coke it ſeems heartily regrets not dividing the houſe. Had he done ſo, Colonel Barré would have had as much occaſion as Mr. Dyſon, in days of yore, to ſing the Lamenta-

tions of Jeremy the prophet; but fortunately for him the magic monoſyllable decided his fortune.

The Colonel however is a grateful man. He retired twice with Mr. Pitt, and I thought his countenance told me, as he returned by the Speaker's chair, that the recruit muſt be ſent to drill. At length the Atlas of the hour *did* ſtart up, but not a ſyllable fell from him in defence of the Earl of Shelburne. On the contrary he ſunk the noble Lord deeper in the mire than all his enemies. Would Cato have taken Cataline for his colleague, ſaid Mr. Pitt (admitting the implication in its full force) —Yes, replied Mr. Burke, " A good man, for a great end, will ſuffer the leſs to avoid the greater evil. Cato *might* have taken Cataline for his colleague, as Cicero abſolutely united with Antony, there are ſeaſons of public peril when the greateſt oppoſites muſt be reconciled for the public ſafety. The Earl of Shelburne was the meſſenger to us from his Majeſty, and we admitted him, not from choice but neceſſity."

It is ſaid, that Mr. Pitt (whoſe merit ſeems to conſiſt much more in a ſelection of elegant lan-

language, and a placid ſtyle of elocution, than in any great vigour of imagination, or ſagacity of intellect) will probably adminiſter but little conſequence to the Earl of Shelburne's adminiſtration. Mr. Pitt proſcribed himſelf from all inferior ſtations, and proclaimed his diſqualification for the objects of his ambition. It was a taſk fitted for the earl of Shelburne to reconcile the ſcruple and gratify the vanity at the ſame time. The moſt extended knowledge in the mere theory of politics is ſuppoſed to be not half ſo neceſſary to a chancellor of the exchequer, as a thorough acquaintance with the interior of a kingdom, and with all its reſources. Study, unaccompanied by great experience, can hardly confer theſe advantages. But the difficulties of the office enhance the flattery to the officer. Mr. Pitt perhaps was irritated by the loſs of his brother's bill, and yet no common offer could ſeduce him. But this was a temptation which muſt have braced the ſhattered ſinews of old age, and very naturally melted the green fortitude of aſpiring youth. His rank in all the future adminiſtrations of which he may be a part, was defined at once. The glory of tranſcending even his father was not to be reſiſted. He held not the reins of nature, and could not, like Joſhua, lengthen out the day. Such another

other hour could never occur. A chancellor of the exchequer at twenty-four was brilliant beyond the vulgar records of civil dignity. There is a ſplendid boldneſs in great attempts which excites our wonder, and we excuſe the folly of Phaeton, in the magnitude of his ambition.

To paſſion therefore, and not to principle, are his admirers willing to impute the union of Mr. Pitt with the Earl of Shelburne. Friendſhip was not the baſe of their coaleſcence, and will be no impediment to their ſeparation. Friendſhip, ſays Cicero, is a rarity amongſt ſtateſmen*. It is probable, that no great aſſociation of ſentiments connects him with the Earl of Shelburne, and the friends of his father, and the friends of the conſtitution ſtill truſt, that he will ſend no buſy meſſenger to the venerable ſhade of great Achilles, with the ſad tale, 'that Pyrrhus is degenerate †'.

If great and good men will not ſupport the Earl of Shelburne's adminiſtration, the very

* Veræ amicitiæ rariſſime inveniuntur in iis, qui in honoribus, reque publica, verſantur.

† —— Referres ergo hæc et nuncius ibis
Pelidæ genitori: illi mea triſtia facta,
Degeneremque Neoptolemum narrare memento. VIRG.

con-

converſe of character will anſwer his end juſt as well. The noble Lord's ſituation is moſt accommodating, and if little bad men prolong his power, he will compound for their virtues. —Let him be ſupported, he cares not how. The maxim reprobated by the Foxites * is the Earl of Shelburne's maxim entirely—*to retain power by any means.*—Aid is welcome to him from all quarters. He would detach no leſs a perſon than an Iriſh Earl to gain a news-paper to his intereſt; and whilſt (for the ſake of form) he refuſed an audience to one editor, he beſtowed one hundred pounds upon an other editor. He knew the firſt hated, and ſuppoſed the ſecond might not hate him; thus he balanced the poſſible fidelity of the one, againſt the poſitive enmity of the other. But there is always a reſource in the principles of a mean politician. Where there is no decent pride there can be no honeſt paſſion. A *hint* given in private, to the editor rejected in public, produced the effect; and, from being the moſt clamorous againſt him, he ſuddenly feels a zeal, like inſpiration, in the Earl of Shelburne's favour. I could be more explicit upon this ſubject; but for confidence perhaps I have ſaid enough; for the full fact, infinitely too

* Flectere ſi nequeo ſuperos, Acheronta movebo.

little.

little. When Mr. Fox was ſecretary of ſtate, the greater number of the news-papers were offered to him. I underſtand his remark was—'That he could only fear their friendſhip, their abuſe could not fail to be of advantage to him.' All the world will allow, that their acknowledged talents and untainted probity deſerved a better countenance. To this reply of Mr. Fox, and to the generous patronage of the Earl of Shelburne, the public is indebted for all the argument and wit which have lately occupied theſe prints, compared to the ſtile of which, the ſcurrility of Billingſgate has the refinement of St. James's. They are indeed eminent in the public eſteem, and cannot fail to be material to the Earl of Shelburne. So much the more, as ſeveral of them have been theſe ten years paſt repreſenting the noble Lord, as a public incendiary, the father of rebellion, and the enemy of the ſtate.

But this is attributable to his art in working wonders.—It is fortunate that he was not born in an age when witchery was perſecuted through godlineſs. The Earl of Shelburne has wrought another miracle, which yields to nothing ſince the days of apoſtolic converſion.

SIR

SIR JAMES LOWTHER *gives the King a ſhip of the line, full manned, at his own expence.*

Sir, I have nothing to do with the low doubts and ſordid conjectures which have been propagated upon this event. I do not mention the report either that this gift is offered upon the chance of a peace, and the ſhip's never being half finiſhed—or that it is the bargain for a peerage—or that it is an act of cunning in the Earl of Shelburne; and that the money is to come from the Treaſury—nor to quote the poet upon Sir James,

'Now ſaves the *nation*, and now ſaves *a groat*:'

But with a view to give my contempt to the whole maſs of ſuſpicions—the character of Sir James Lowther is the ampleſt refutation of every charge. When I conſider the virtue of his heart and the wiſdom of his head: the excellence of his morals and the expanſion of his mind: his honorable conduct in all his private duties: his exactneſs, punctuality, and rectitude in all his commercial dealings: his long life of private faith and public probity—I muſt take the act preciſely as it appears to be, *a deed of pure and ſpotleſs patriotiſm.*

Such an event, two hundred years ago, might have brought ſuſpicions of ſorcery upon the Earl of Shelburne. But this is an enlightened age, and why ſhould any man wonder that the Earl of Bute's ſon-in-law ſhould preſent the Crown with ſuch a gift, when Lord Shelburne and the Duke of Grafton are of the royal cabinet. The illuminations which brighten upon the world from the King's council are wonderful. His Majeſty's preſent Lord Privy Seal concurs in employing the ſon of Samuel Vaughan to negociate a peace for England at the Court of Verſailles.—Adieu to prejudice for evermore.

Good-nature is ever confident. There are ſome excellent people in this country, who have a conſolation in the worſt diſaſters. The Earl of Shelburne has bound himſelf to the meaſure of a more equal repreſentation in parliament. Let him give us that, and the moſt infamous adminiſtration cannot injure us—Nay, if the Earl of Shelburne himſelf continue miniſter he cannot hurt us. This is true wiſdom, and it muſt be the more admitted in this proteſtant country, as it is the chief baſis of the Roman Catholic faith. The Pope is not held perſonally infallible. He is only ſo at the head of a general council. It is the number

ber that conſtitutes the infallibility. If one or two hundred additional members are added to the preſent Houſe of Commons, it will be then impoſſible that body can be guilty of ignorance or proſtituted to any act of baſeneſs. The Houſe of Lords has always emerged from ſervitude in proportion to the acceſſion of new peers. All the adminiſtrations of this reign have been lovers of conſtitutional liberty, and to ſecure it, his preſent Majeſty has exceeded even James the Firſt in ennobling his ſubjects. I will not ſay that the Earl of Shelburne may not *appear* friendly to a change in the repreſentation, but I muſt reſcue his character from the diſgrace of being ſuppoſed amicable to that meaſure, in mere compliance with the ſpirit of a letter to the Wiltſhire committee, or any declaration in the Houſe of Lords. The noble Earl is bound by no declaration. He is above all theſe infirmities. I doubt not he *may* be as much a public friend, as he *will* be a private enemy to the plan of equaliſing the repreſentation. He would do any thing rather than loſe his ſtation. This is not an hour to hazard an inſurrection, otherwiſe I ſhould credit the report of his calling in the old miniſtry. That he would gladly join '*that beaſt, that thing**, which he could not call a man,' I can well imagine. But there

* Epithets applied to Lord North, by Lord Shelburne in the Houſe of Peers.

is ſome conſideration even for the old party. Lord North well knows, there is a wide ſpace between misfortnne and contempt, between political diſgrace and moral infamy. The Lord Advocate of Scotland was *not* proſcribed by Mr. Fox, and of this the Earl of Shelburne took immediate advantage. But Mr. Dundas has yet to account to the world, why he abandoned his former party. The acknowledged infamy of his political opinions renders him unworthy of my notice; and if his deſertion from his old friends has been unconditional to them, he is beneath the dignity of reſentment. If all failed the Earl of Shelburne, I am not ſure that he may not adopt thoſe very principles which he reprobated in Mr. Fox, and which obliged the latter to quit the cabinet. I believe he would forget his own nature to pleaſe the *Commons*. He has the Lords in his *pocket*, and the King in his *hand*.

To the Sovereign he has been pretty uniform, and I dare ſay he would have been entirely ſo, if it were not neceſſary to the ridiculous conſiſtency of his character, that he ſhould contradict himſelf upon every public opinion he has ever delivered. The Earl of Shelburne, upon his own appointment to the Treaſury, maintained the doctrine of the King's unqualified

power

power of conferring offices and honors. Five months before this, upon Lord Sackville's being called to the peerage, the Earl of Shelburne queſtioned his Majeſty's right even to create a peer, and quoted Lord Chancellor Weſt againſt it. A man of the firſt impreſſion would call this audacious nonſenſe. Merely to ennoble a man, according to the current rate of the peerage, ſuppoſes nothing of much intereſt to the nation. But every ſubject has ſome concern in the conduct of a miniſter. He has a ſcope for miſchief, and is therefore reſponſible. If the King's unqualified power of making a peer be a queſtionable point, his power of making a miniſter is ſurely fifty times more ſo.

This however is a ſmall defect in the ſcale of the noble Lord's conduct. He knows, that all the ſlaughter of the laſt century has originated in too free an exerciſe of the prerogative. Yet the noble Lord has delivered ſentiments upon that ſubject too valuable not to have made ſome impreſſion in the Royal boſom. What is it to the people, whether they are injured by the *prerogative*, or by the *influence* of the crown? A dirk wounds as fatally as a poniard. Much labour has indeed been employed at the Revolution to define the prerogative, but the Earl of Shelburne knows it ſtill contains enough of a

fortunate

fortunate ambiguity under the maze of which every neceſſary effect of influence may be derived. The noble Lord's opinions upon *this*, upon *American independence*, upon a *king of Mahrattas*, upon *reviving the negative*, &c. have had their due weight at St. James's, and I believe he is as confident in the ſincerity of his preſent Majeſty's attachment as any of his ſervants can be.

This is a ſerious hour, important to the liberties of the nation and the dignity of the empire, beyond any period in the Britiſh annals. It is material to his Majeſty to conſult, not indeed what the world calls, the *King's friends*, but the friends of the Engliſh conſtitution, becauſe they are the true friends of the houſe of Brunſwick. Experiments have been hazarded in the early parts of his reign, which made the adminiſtrations of that time univerſally execrable, and a loving ſubject would have leſs cauſe to lament, if the infamy of his ſervants did not then impart ſome portion of injury to a character, whom the laws have generouſly lifted above the neceſſity of having any intereſt in the vicious principles and malignant artifices of his miniſters. His preſent Majeſty is bleſſed with many virtues, but muſt, in common with all the kings upon earth, wiſh

an

an increaſe of his own authority, and conſequently a diminution of his people's privileges. The Earl of Shelburne is well underſtood. Even the appearance of a deſign to hold another ſtruggle with the free ſpirit of the nation might raiſe a flame, which neither power nor corruption itſelf could extinguiſh. In this country, profligate as it is, there yet lingers a ſtrong regard for liberty. A Britiſh boſom is apt to glow at the ſound of it, and the ſplendid merit of preſerving that beſt gift of God, which is expelled from every other kingdom in Europe, might ſtimulate indolence, and animate even luxury herſelf, to conſecrate at the altar of freedom. Original excellence is the moſt abſolute, and the virtue without example, has a double claim to applauſe. Civil liberty is proſcribed by the reſt of Europe, and millions of Britons can be levied by the bare glory of affording an aſylum to this illuſtrious fugitive. This were an enthuſiaſm upon the baſe of reaſon, and enthuſiaſts are always the moſt dangerous enemies. If I am capable of forming an opinion, THIS IS THE MOST CRITICAL MOMENT OF HIS MAJESTY's REIGN. All his ſkill is neceſſary to direct him, and if, upon conſulting his wiſdom, he thinks it is for his own, for his family's, and his people's intereſt, to employ a miniſter, whoſe character is, in a

few

ew words, *That he is ſuſpected by every man in the nation, who does not deſpiſe or deteſt him*; I have only to ſay, in the gentle language of legal mercy, '*God ſend him a good deliverance.*'

And now, Sir, without making any apology for addreſſing myſelf to you, I ſhall conclude this letter (in which, if I have imputed a principle to, or related an incident of, the Earl of Shelburne, which, in a ſingle inſtance, ſhall be proved untrue, or unwarranted by his conduct and public declarations, I deſire to loſe all credit with the public for every other part)—I will not praiſe you, for if I were a panegyriſt you are above my praiſe. The object of Sir George Saville's life has been the good of the ſtate to which he belongs; and if the principles of this letter tend to the benefit of the Commonwealth, his ſanction is without doubt ſecured to it. The meaſure is juſtified in the motive.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT,

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE JOHN EARL OF STAIR.

My Lord,

I HAVE read your pamphlet with great attention. The preceding ſheets will, I think, afford you intelligence upon ſome points which you allude to, and upon which you are certainly (or appear to be) miſinformed. This poſtſcript will delay the publication of my letter to Sir George Saville for a few hours. I have not time to make many remarks upon your performanee, and in the little I ſhall ſay, the remoteſt diſreſpect is not meant to your Lordſhip. Your induſtry deſerves commendation, your family is antient and honorable; the name of *Stair* is illuſtrious, and your own perſonal character is reſpectable.

If your pamphlet diſcovered principles ſo unqueſtionable, as to leave me no proper office, but that of a critic, for your ſake, I ſhould not comment upon the ſtyle of your writing. The ſubſtance of it, my Lord, is my object, and indeed you have afforded me in the firſt place,

the ſtrongeſt *preſumptions* that you have deſerted that ſyſtem of politics which was traceable in your former publications; and in the ſecond, the ſtrongeſt *proofs* that you are inconſiſtent with yourſelf, and palpably unjuſt to others. I have but a few hours to ſhew that you have done this, and I thank you for rendering the taſk perfectly eaſy. A review of your former profeſſed and preſent implied principles is all that is requiſite. Argument is unneceſſary. My Lord, is it fair to make no diſtinctions between the miſconduct of the Earl of Shelburne, and the open diſintereſtod acts of thoſe who united with him in the month of March, and quitted him in the month of July? You could not treat of the adminiſtration of this country for the laſt nine months, without adverting to *his* bad deeds. Such a partiality would be too palpable, and the friend were fatal who ſhould ſay he was guiltleſs. You talk of a diviſion of ſpoils after the capture of St. James's. Pray, my Lord, need you be told, that except 'a lean baronetage' (to adopt you own words) a ſtar or a ſtring, no friend of Mr. Fox's has any thing to boaſt from his adminiſtration. The Earl of Shelburne knew that honours without emoluments were of little real value, and enriched his own friends. Malice, until this moment,

has

has not dared to advance ſo bold a falſehood, as that Mr. Fox, or his friends, ſought the ends of avarice, in preference to the public good.

I do not mean, my Lord, to queſtion the correctneſs of your calculations, as to public debt, and public credit. If you are right, the facts you publiſh are dreadful. So great is the national debt, that the State muſt pay fifteen millions annually, and the revenue cannot be made to exceed twelve millions. The State cannot now pay more in intereſt, than at the rate of thirteen ſhillings and ſix pence to the pound—If the war continues another year, the abilities of the nation will not pay more than twelve ſhillings and a penny. And you deſpair of one pound of the principal being diſcharged at all. This is the abridged import of your calculations and deductions, and it is a moſt deplorable review of the condition of this unhappy country. In your pamphlet of laſt January you declare, that theſe unexampled calamities were brought upon this nation by the miniſters of that time. No language could be more clear than that in which you conveyed your execration of them, and of the accurſed war in which they plunged this country. How am I to account, my Lord, for your panegyrics upon theſe very miniſters, in your pre-

ſent publication, and for conveying ſomething more than a mere implication, that it would be for the common intereſt if they were reſtored? In your former pamphlet you aſſerted, that the miniſters would ruin the nation. In the preſent, you affirm that the nation is ruined. From page 17 to 18 is engroſſed with proving the State has no reſources; and in page 2, you applaud the former miniſters *for not deſpairing of reſources*. You declare you cannot tell 'on what fair ground of honeſt candor they were diſpoſſeſſed'—You could give fifty reaſons yourſelf about a year ago for diſpoſſeſſing them—No man ever condemned them in terms more unequivocal. You ſay, in page 3, the new miniſtry had neither the *will* nor the *power* to change the ſyſtem—My Lord, why would you be ſo careleſs in aſſertions? They proved that they had both will and power, and did very materially change the ſyſtem. Was the relinquiſhment of the American war no change of ſyſtem? Was the peace of Ireland, and getting 20,000 ſeamen, no change of ſyſtem? Were the contractors bill, the revenue officers bill, the civil liſt bill, no change of ſyſtem? The adminiſtration laſted juſt three months, and in that time this important change of ſyſtem took place. If you do not think this a change of ſyſtem, I believe,

believe, my Lord, you are the only man in the kingdom who does not.

You affect to ridicule the acclamations of the nation upon the change in March, and addreſſes, you ſay, p. 40, 'flowed in from every quarter.'——I do not remember that a ſingle addreſs came from Scotland; but certainly the court was crowded with addreſſes from every part of England and Ireland upon the occaſion. Will you allow any thing, my Lord, for the ſenſe of mankind? Do you think there was ever a meaſure, in which the hearts and the judgments of the people more ſincerely concurred than in that change? Then wherefore the general miſtruſt of England—the univerſal diſcontent of Ireland? I'll tell you, my Lord, becauſe that adminiſtration no longer exiſts. I am ſorry to ſay, my Lord, that in page 37 you loſe ſight of liberality as well as juſtice; no lover of civil liberty can with an honeſt motive ſneer at the Iriſh volunteers. I ſpeak with deference when I preſume you are not converſant in Iriſh politics. You was at the election of Lord Lauderdale: if you diſapprove the conduct of the Iriſh, you had an opportunity of replying to Lord Hopetoun, who pronounced a moſt flattering eulogium upon the volunteers. Be aſſured,

my

my Lord, he will derive more honour from it, than your Lordſhip will receive from that peculiar ſtyle of flattery to Lord Shelburne in the ſame paragraph of your pamphlet, that ſneers at the Iriſh. You are friendly to Lord Shelburne, I think I need not entertain one doubt of it. For your information, my Lord (though I believe not for your Lordſhip's conſolation) I will let you know the truth. The Iriſh are ſolidly diſcontented. They have no confidence in this adminiſtration, and it is only the remoteneſs of your reſidence which could make you ignorant of that man's name, who of all the men upon earth is moſt deteſted in the kingdom of Ireland. But how ſtands Mr. Fox, you will ſay? I will tell you a public fact, my Lord, which from your ideas of Iriſh affairs, I muſt ſuppoſe, has never reached you. Mr. Montgomery, the member for Donegall (a gentleman who, to the great grief of his friends, reſts under a general ſuſpicion for correctneſs of intellect) made a motion in the Iriſh Parliament, diſreſpectful to Mr. Fox, and in the whole houſe not a ſingle man could be found to ſecond a motion, ridiculous in itſelf, and execrated as to its tendency. Form your own concluſion from this fact.

Upon

Upon the ſubject of reforms, my Lord, it gives me pain to ſay, you hold no meaſure. In page 29 you ſay, that miniſters deſerve contempt for boaſting, that œconomy would produce much good, and in the very next page you ſay, it will be grateful and advantageous to the public. In page 33 again, you ſay, the public gratitude and thanks are due for the conſiderable reformations already begun, and in the next page to this you attempt in a very particular manner to diſparage the chief reformer; and, leſt your own good proſe ſhould fail, you call in Shakeſpeare's poetry to your aſſiſtance. This may ſeem ſtrange to ſome people: it is no matter of ſurprize to me. You abuſed the miniſtry of Lord North in January, in November you defend it. Even upon this ſubject you would ſhelter him from cenſure. You ſay, miniſters ſcarce ever have an influence ſufficient to eradicate abuſes. I am ſure, my Lord, very few men in the nation will agree with you, that Lord North, for one miniſter, had not influence enough to check the ſhameful abuſes in public offices. Every good man in this country ſeems agreed, that Mr. Burke in his conduct as paymaſter was more than barely conſiſtent: he is ſaid to have acted diſintereſtedly even to a degree that was noble. And yet you are more ſore upon that point than all the reſt,

Do

Do you think it was criminal to make his ſon deputy paymaſter, at a ſalary of 1000 pounds a year, which place is ſaid to have produced 12000 pounds annually to his predeceſſor Mr. Caſwell? Or are you diſpleaſed, that, inſtead of making fifty thouſand pounds a year, like his predeceſſor, Mr. Burke ſhould reduce his own profits to four thouſand pounds a year? Do I overſtate the produce of Mr. Rigby? Has your Lordſhip read the reports of the commiſſioners of accounts? Seriouſly then, my Lord, do you think any man will value your heart the more for the contents of page 34? I believe it cannot injure the reputation of your head.

Let us oppoſe your theory to Mr. Burke's practice. You had the full ſcope of imagination; yet all the retrenchment *you* could recommend was to deprive the commanders of regiments of the profits of cloathing, page 25. The next moment you ſay, this is *no* object for retrenchment, for it does not pay the expence of attending the regiments, and then again conclude with remarking, that it is the moſt ſtriking object of reformation, and from which only an increaſe of revenue could be expected.

Military ideas were natural to an Earl of Stair, but I think the Colonels will not much thank

thank you for your attachment to the military; you are now a ſoldier, then a financier, and at another time a commiſſary. Sometimes for the army, ſometimes for the public, and ſometimes for neither. Your Lordſhip is wondrouſly enamoured of the old miniſtry. In January you called the American war the moſt accurſed this country ever waged; in November you ſay 'the late miniſters deſerved well of the public for the great and unparalleled attention with which they ſupported the American war.' You follow this with a comment which Lord Germaine might well have dictated, and the paſſage is concluded with a compliment to the Admiralty, as warm as my Lord Mulgrave himſelf could have expreſſed it. The wonder is, my Lord, how all this can come from *you*. I underſtand, you ſeldom approved the political proceedings of the corporation of Edinburgh, and yet your paragraph, in favour of that miniſtry whom you execrated in January, is almoſt literally in the ſhape of one of the reſolutions of that Edinburgh meeting, which would *not* return thanks to the King for changing the miniſtry.

But you make amends for all by your opinion upon the ſubject of the peace. You ſaid laſt January, that 'no peace ſhort of abſolute

ruin could be pronounced a bad one;' in November you urge the neceſſity of peace, in p. 3. in p. 28 you ſay it is the only œconomy; and then you add what would open your character ſufficiently to me, if in p. 35 you did not diſcover yourſelf as clearly as noon-day. In that paſſage all your inconſiſteney is accounted for. The Earl of Stair adopts not merely the ſentiments, but the very words of the Earl of Shelburne and of Lord North. If we cannot get peace upon our terms, let us carry on the war with our lives and fortunes. Had the firſt lord of the treaſury been at your elbow, I could not wiſh to ſee a paſſage hit off more completely to his purpoſe. Has the Earl of Shelburne, my Lord, given you any reaſons to think, that Lord Rockingham under-rated your talents? or is it your object, firſt to convince him that you think ſo, that he may afterwards give a ſanction to your ſelf-love?

But, my Lord, in page 40 there is an aſſertion which I can hardly pardon. In matters of opinion great latitude is allowable; in points of fact there is no alternative. You ſay that a conteſt for power firſt diſcovers a difference of opinion in matters of public import, evidently alluding to Lord Shelburne's appointment to the treaſury. My Lord, I am aſtoniſhed you can be

ignorant

gnorant that the matter of Mr. Fox's reſignation had been completely cleared up, the laſt day of the laſt ſeſſions, in the Houſe of Lords, to the ſatisfaction of the whole nation. *The Earl of Shelburne convicted himſelf of falſehood.* I will not ſuppoſe, at leaſt I will not aſſert, that you are acquainted with this circumſtance. The paſſage as it ſtands, were this fact within your knowledge, would greatly diſhonour your Lordſhip's character.

I entirely agree with you, my Lord, 'that a man would gain more credit, and certainly would be much more ſure of preferment, by an ingenious rhetorical apology for the want of every human virtue, than by poſſeſſing, without the power of announcing them, every great and good quality that can adorn human nature.' This I think, my Lord, was preciſely the qualification that recommended your good countryman Mr. Dundas, to the Earl of Shelburne. Men of that deſcription are always welcome to him.

It very well becomes you, my Lord, after alluding to the Lord Advocate of Scotland, to attempt to be merry upon orators. The jeſt was well-timed, if it were ſucceſsful. You do not hold a *certain claſs* of ſpeakers in greater

contempt than I do; but you do not ſeem diſpoſed to diſtinguiſh, and there we differ. Your ſtory of the pea-ſhooter anſwers no end that I can ſee, but to ſhew how little the Earl of Stair values one of the nobleſt of intellectual arts. I give your Lordſhip credit for the elegance of your taſte; but if you expected this paſſage would promote the reputation of your wit, I fear you have greatly deceived yourſelf.

Every ſenſible reader of your preſent work will be ſurprized to find a deſertion of your profeſſed principles. It cannot fail to be a matter of aſtoniſhment that the ſame man, who in January reprobates the Tories for loſing America, ſhould in November imply a manifeſt wiſh that theſe very Tories were reſtored to conduct the government. To me, my Lord, it appears in a different light. I have formed an opinion of your Lordſhip from ſome parts of your former pamphlet, which makes your preſent work the leſs inconſiſtent. In that you did aſſert ſome miſtakes, which any ſhopkeeper could ſet you right in. You ſaid (for ſome ſtrange purpoſe) that the greateſt æra of England's felicity, was from 1765 to 1775; and that imagination can ſcarcely ſurpaſs it. My Lord, I affirm, that this country, ſince the maſſacres of the laſt century, never felt ſo much

much domeſtic diſtreſs and foreign diſgrace, as in theſe very ten years. Do you forget, my Lord, that it was in this very interval, the conſtitution was ſtabbed in the affair of the Middleſex election—That the deſpotic attempt was made to cut up liberty by the roots, by general warrants—that the greateſt and wiſeſt men in this country affirmed openly in both Houſes of Parliament, that the people's repreſentatives were traitors, and ſold the rights of the nation—That the crown was aſſailed with clamours from all parts of the kingdom—that the ſoldiery was let looſe and aſſumed the office of the magiſtracy—and that the whole nation fell into an uproar, ſuperior to any interior diſtraction ſince the civil wars. This proves our domeſtic felicity in that period. For exterior glory, look to the contemptible buſineſs of Corſica, the ſhameful affair of Falkland's Iſland. The loſs of the Swediſh liberties without a ſingle effort to ſecure them. (Indeed *this* is eaſily accounted for—The cauſe of the King and miniſtry of Sweden was the cauſe of the King and miniſtry of England.)—It was in this period, his Majeſty aſſured his Parliament from year to year, that he was making efforts to effect a peace between Ruſſia and the Porte. The people of this country naturally expected their Sovereign would have

have had the glory of making this peace; when, to their diſappointment, and to his diſgrace, the French ambaſſador at Conſtantinople ſnatched away this honour, and ratified the peace of the North, before a ſyllable of it was known in this country. Good effects, my Lord, flowed from this. They are manifeſt, and the Empreſs was certainly as ſincere in her mediation between us and Holland laſt April, as your Lordſhip was in your political principles laſt January.

But, my Lord, you went farther ſtill in your former pamphlet. Deſtitute of any apparent object but that of injuring yourſelf, you talked in high terms of the advantages of the peace of Paris. From that moment I ſuſpected you. The diſhonour which this nation has ſuſtained in that event are acknowledged by all Europe, and can only be defended by the adherents of certain ſtateſmen. I have in theſe ſheets cautiouſly avoided falling into national reflections. They are too common in this country; and indeed it is difficult in treating of the politics of the preſent reign, to eſcape this general malady. Diſtinctly from political prejudice I have for Scotland the greateſt reſpect—for Scotchmen the greateſt affection. To taint them would be to wound myſelf. My ſociety is in a great

a great part compoſed of the natives of that country, and I do not dread that I ſhall ever lament the connection. You extort the neceſſity of ſaying, that you could not in theſe glaring inſtances deviate from public facts, unleſs with a view to cover the guilt of Lord Bute and his minions. In your preſent work the ſame motive meets me in every page (except indeed in your calculations). To ſerve Lord Shelburne is in effect to ſerve Lord Bute: he is a branch of the old trunk, and it was only a blaſt of an ill wind that broke him off. Public ſhame might prevent Lord North from joining him now, but in the GREAT END, you all agree. It will be wrong to ſay, that the Earl of Shelburne quitted the miniſtry in 1768, becauſe he would not ſupport the prevailing ſyſtem. The Earl of Shelburne put the ſeal of State to what the Duke de Choiſeul affirmed to be, and afterwards proved to be, a falſehood, and he was forced out in conſequence. The truth is, even that adminiſtration were afraid to confide to him the real intentions of government. There is a ſaying recorded of a man who knew him well; he ſaid, he had known men who *became* Jeſuits, but the only man he ever heard of who was *born* a Jeſuit, was the Earl of Shelburne. Malagrida, my Lord, was not to be truſted at any time. I will not diſhonour you by ſaying,

you

you are the *direct* advocate of this miniſter. It is the greateſt injury I can do an honeſt man. Perhaps it would ſuit your peculiar turn to ſay, you are the friend of no party. Be it ſo, my Lord; but I always ſuſpect this appearance of implicit neutrality. It is ſeldom ſolid. You love to quote Shakeſpeare, and I will conclude this poſtſcript with a paſſage from that celebrated author, leaving your Lordſhip to make the application.

———This is ſome fellow,
Who, having been praiſed for bluntneſs, doth affect
A ſaucy boldneſs, and conſtrains the garb
Quite from his nature. He can't flatter, he——
An honeſt mind and plain, he muſt ſpeak truth;
And they will take it, ſo; if not, he's plain.
Theſe kind of knaves I know, which in this plainneſs
Harbour more craft, and more corrupter ends,
Than twenty ſilly ducking obſervants
That ſtretch their duties nicely.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord, &c.

STOCKDALE's NEW COMPANION.

This Day is publiſhed,

Price ONE SHILLING,

STOCKDALE's NEW COMPANION

TO THE

NEW ROYAL KALENDAR,

AND

COURT AND CITY REGISTER,

For the Year 1783;

BEING

A LIST of all the CHANGES in ADMINISTRATION, from the Acceſſion of the preſent King, in October 1760, to the preſent Time.

To which is prefixed,

A LIST of the late and preſent HOUSE of COMMONS,

SHOWING

The Changes made in the Members of Parliament by the General Election in September 1780, with the Names of the Candidates where the Elections were conteſted, the Numbers polled, and the Deciſions ſince made by the Select Committees.

Alſo the Dates when each City and Borough firſt ſent Repreſentatives to Parliament, the Right of Election in each Place, and the ſuppoſed Number of Voters.

To which is added,

A COMPLETE INDEX OF NAMES.

PRINTED FOR

J. STOCKDALE,
(From Mr. ALMON's) Piccadilly;
T. CARNAN, St. Paul's Church-Yard; and
R. FAULDER, New Bond Street.

*** Be careful to aſk for STOCKDALE's NEW COMPANION, which may be had ſeparate, or bound with the NEW ROYAL KALENDAR.

NEW PAMPHLETS printed for J. STOCKDALE, oppoſite BURLINGTON-HOUSE, PICCADILLY.

1. FACTS and their CONSEQUENCES: ſubmitted to the Conſideration of the Public at large; but more particularly to that of the FINANCE MINISTER, and thoſe who are, or mean to become, Creditors of the State. To which is added, a Poſtſcript, containing Thoughts on the Alteration ſaid to be intended of the Land Tax. By JOHN Earl of STAIR. Fourth Edition, Price 1s.

2. REFLECTIONS upon the Preſent State of England, and the Independence of America. By THOMAS DAY, Eſq; Second Edition, Price 2s.

3. SELECT CASES of the Diſorder commonly termed PARALYSIS of the LOWER EXTREMITIES. To which is prefixed an extraordinary Caſe of CATALEPSY. By JOHN JEBB, M. D. F. R. S. Price 1s.

4. A LETTER to the Author of the LUCUBRATIONS during a ſhort Receſs. Price 1s.

5. THE CONSTITUTIONS of the ſeveral INDEPENDENT STATES of AMERICA; the Declaration of Independence; the Articles of Confederation between the ſaid States; the Treaties between his Moſt Chriſtian Majeſty and the United States of America. PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF CONGRESS.

6. An ADDRESS to the PEOPLE of the NETHERLANDS, on the preſent alarming and moſt dangerous Situation of the REPUBLIC of HOLLAND; ſhewing the true Motives of the moſt unpardonable Delays of the Executive Power in putting the Republic into a proper State of Defence, and the Advantages of an Alliance with Holland, France, and America. By a Dutchman. Tranſlated from the Dutch Original. Price 2s. 6d.

7. The CANDIDATE, a FARCE in Two Acts, as it was performed with univerſal Applauſe at the Theatre Royal in the HAY MARKET. By Mr. JOHN DENT. Second Edition, Price 1s.

8. STATE of the PUBLIC DEBTS, and of the Annual Intereſt and Benefits paid for them; as they will ſtand on the 5th of January, 1783. Likewiſe as they will ſtand (if the War continues) on the 5th of January 1784. To which the Attention of the Public is humbly requeſted, before they decide as to Peace or War. Together with ſome Thoughts on the Extent to which the State may be benefited by Oeconomy; and alſo Reflections on the Conduct and Merit of the Parties contending for Power. By JOHN Earl of STAIR. Second Edition, Price 1s.

9. LETTER addreſſed to the Abbe RAYNAL on the Affairs of North America. In which the Miſtakes in the Abbe's Account of the Revolution of America are corrected and cleared up. By THOMAS PAINE, M. A. of the Univerſity of Pennſylvania, and Author of the Pamphlet, and other Publications, entitled, COMMON SENSE. 4th Edition.